

EMOTIONAL FACTORS IN LEARNING

By LOIS BARCLAY MURPHY
and HENRY LADD

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
NEW YORK · MORNINGSID E HEIGHTS

COPYRIGHT 1944, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, NEW YORK

First printing 1944
Second printing 1945
Third printing 1946
Fourth printing 1953

Published in Great Britain, Canada, India, and Pakistan
by Geoffrey Cumberlege: Oxford University Press,
London, Toronto, Bombay, and Karachi

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PREFACE

THIS STUDY is one of a series of reports of work done at Sarah Lawrence College under a five-year grant from the General Education Board. Funds from the grant made possible the release of Henry Ladd for part-time work for three years to make a careful follow through of individual students. Some of the resulting case studies were abbreviated by me for inclusion in this monograph. The grant also permitted me to devote the equivalent of half time for one year to study a freshman class.

As the work progressed my plan was modified so that the study centered upon the educational development through four years of the students in two entering classes. The materials at my disposal included thirty full and intensive case studies which had been prepared by a group of teachers for the Commission on Adolescents of the Progressive Education Association, together with an analysis of these studies which I had made at the request of the Commission. In addition to these were weekly records and case reports on fifty students in the exploratory courses (which had been developed for the dual purpose of giving freshmen an opportunity to become acquainted with new fields and to give the instructor an opportunity to become better acquainted with the students); the usual two-page quarterly reports through four years on approximately two hundred and fifty students from two entering classes; and the following test data: the American Council Examination; the Allport-Vernon Values Test; the Strong Vocational Interest Test; the Bernreuter Personality Inventory. The college requires each student going on leave to file a record of destination and plans and the infirmary keeps a record of the nature of each contact with each student. Besides these records, interviews with students graduating from the two classes under study were stenographically recorded. My chapters in Part I are based on these written

records. Henry Ladd also made use of this material in the case studies in Part II, supplementing it, however, by data collected from teachers to check on specific questions concerning individual students. All names of students, places, and teachers have been changed for the purpose of disguising the cases used.

Tragically for all of us at Sarah Lawrence who had shared much with him and learned much from him, Henry Ladd died in June, 1941, literally in the midst of his studies. Many studies were unfinished and, among those tentatively completed, he had not decided which ones he wished to include in this book. The final task of choice, revision, and condensing was thus left to me and had to wait until time was available for the large task of reviewing his records and notes. The studies here presented vary in completeness; I have included them with very little change except for condensation.

At every point in our work Henry Ladd and I relied upon many members of the Sarah Lawrence staff; their insight and understanding of adolescent girls in college provided the material out of which our findings were constructed. We used especially the generous records, case studies, and notes on special conferences by teachers in the areas of literature and social science, since these were the groups that made the fullest studies of their students. In particular, the discussion of authority patterns makes large use of a paper by Genevieve Foster, and one of the case summaries in Part II is largely the work of Max Geismar. Our seminars with Caroline Zachry, Erich Fromm, Anna Hartoch and other analysts both provided important concepts and greatly stimulated us to look at the experience of students with sympathetic vision. Lawrence K. Frank's insight into the relation between therapy and education gave a deeper meaning to our own concern with "integrated" learning. The contribution, over many years, of former members of the Research Committee—especially Mary S. Fisher, Eugene Lerner, Helen Lynd, and Willis Fisher—is reflected at many points in the book.

Statistical help was given by Alice Hall, Ruth Lee, and by Florence Clarke who also expertly supervised the preparation of the manuscript. Constance Warren, Esther Rauschenbush, Goodwin Watson, and Gardner Murphy contributed helpful judgment regarding the selection, organization, and revision of material from the too-bulky first draft, as did Beatrice Doerschuk, who has devotedly helped with each stage of the book from the first draft through the proofs.

Throughout the book the points of view are our own responsibility; although we have drawn heavily upon the observations of our colleagues they would doubtless be glad to disown this use of their ideas especially since last year's clothes are always out-of-date at a college where faculty as well as students are maturing.

It is my hope that this presentation will serve not only as a sort of memorial to a beloved colleague, but as a means of sharing with a wider educational audience Henry Ladd's deep understanding of students.

LOIS BARCLAY MURPHY

*Sarah Lawrence College
Bronxville, N.Y.
April, 1944*

CONTENTS

PART ONE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN EDUCATIONAL POINT OF VIEW

Preface	v
Individual Education and Social Change	3
The Role of Diagnosis in Educational Guidance	10
Interests and Motivation	34
Varieties of Learning Attitudes	62
Stages in Orientation and Growth	76
The Ways in Which Development Comes	90
The Role of "Problems" in Learning	104
Difficulties with Specific Types of Work	117
Patterns of Personality	128
Insecurity at the College Level	137
Authority Problems in Relation to Learning	145
Summary of Dynamic Factors in Learning	157

PART TWO: INDIVIDUAL STUDIES

Introduction	169
Ambition, Narrow Talent, and a Rigid Personality: Hortense	174
Ambivalence Resulting from Early Shock: Louise	206
A Practical, Limited Student: Fern	244
Insight without Persistent Goals: Priscilla	274
A Shy Student: Marian	302

Success without Growth: Madeleine, Julia, and Judith	313
Therapeutic Uses of the Curriculum: Patsy and Anne	356
A Correction to Deterministic Thinking: Virginia	380
Index	395

*PART I: THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN
EDUCATIONAL POINT OF VIEW*

INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION AND SOCIAL CHANGE

WHEN A COLLEGE faces the fact that the accumulated treasures of our culture are too great to be imparted in one authoritative curriculum; when it admits that the skills of higher learning are too many to be mastered by any one person; when it confronts the modern reality that colleges do not exist solely to breed scholars but also to educate citizens—then the college has relinquished the hitherto cherished foundations for determination of the curriculum.

How can the curriculum be shaped without any extrinsic criteria of what the student “should know in order to be well educated”? There were in the twenties, and still are, a variety of possible answers. At Sarah Lawrence, the answer has come from a broad consideration of individual differences leading to an emphasis upon the interests and needs of the student, as seen in relation to the direction of her total development. One assumption underlying this emphasis is that a democracy may be enriched by the development of individuals in terms of their own capacities and interests; without this fundamental appreciation of the importance of encouraging individual differences for the sake of growth of the culture no such point of view could be carried far.

Since the emphasis on planning college work in relation to such individual differences leads not only to a wide variety of programs but also to flexibility within the teaching of each course there is a further assumption: that the so-called “logic” of each subject-matter field is not so impregnable as is sometimes assumed; that recent changes in the teaching of physics, mathematics, languages, psychology, and history demonstrate different bases on which sequences in the learning of subject matter may be built. Each field has come through a process of historical development, usually originating with concrete

problems to be solved. As examples we may cite the stimulus of fifteenth-century explorations to geography, map making and history; the development of comparative religion as a field of study after the early investigations of Max Müller; the ad hoc development of techniques for use by the anthropologist; and the sequence of problem-to-be-solved followed by the hunt for the method of solution, characteristic of the development of psychology. If Newton, Darwin, Pasteur, or Freud found that the way to knowledge consisted in formulating questions and finding or creating methods of answering them, it may be fair to assume that this method, even though adopted unwittingly, might be a profitable one for a new generation of questioners.

Even when the historical approach is used, the framework within which historical materials have meaning varies from one student to another just as it does from one generation to another. In the 1920s college students were introduced to different evaluations of Renaissance art and Victorian ethics from those gaining the ascendancy today. Thus, it seems reasonable for teachers to think about the heritage of the past discriminatingly; a great book is hardly a great book unless it is a great experience to the student reading it.

The individualization of education implied in the paragraphs above is not new. From the early Christian era and even before it, the expansion of the world through wars and geographical discoveries, and the concomitant expansion of knowledge have thrown religion, art, and education back to the individual. In such periods of expansion individualization has repeatedly paralleled the universalization of ideas. This universalization serves to expand the areas of knowledge beyond compassable limits and to dissolve the provincial criteria of "rightness" which had been the chief support of the "authoritative" curriculum. The universalization of thought and of values now resulting from the side-by-side living, working, and fighting of New World soldiers with Pacific Islanders, Chinese soldiers, common people of India and North Africa

may be of greater intellectual stimulus than that of the geographical discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The long-time effects of *The Origin of Species* upon history, religion, and social science—and thus upon college curricula—could not be anticipated in 1859, any more than could the long-time effects of Copernicus and Newton upon the development of natural science. Similarly, the long-time effects of today's winding up of space into a smaller area for transportation, today's world-wide lend-lease, food sharing, gun toting, and propagandizing are hard to foresee. We can, however, be sure that the patterns of education of the last fifty years will be broken up and that many new experiments in curriculum will be made in the attempt to replace or adapt education to the needs of students of the coming generations.

Whatever the new pattern of curriculum may be in a given college, it remains a major task of education to prepare each student for an era of new adjustments by helping her to achieve maturity, competence, and confidence in her ability to deal with the problems awaiting her in the postwar world. Thus we must start where she is now, with the abilities, interests, strengths and weaknesses she brings along with her as she comes to college. In 1928–29 when this college opened its doors and in 1934 when it first undertook intensive study of freshmen and their needs, no one foresaw the events of the '40s now upon us. Yet the college was opened at the end of the era of prosperity and from the first it thought of education as preparation for life in a period of rapid social change. That the tempo of change has been accelerated by the war against Fascism merely emphasizes the importance of learning from and sharing with other educators some of the results of our attempts to understand students and their problems in learning, growing up, becoming mature participants in this changing world.

In an authoritarian period, when a highly formalized structure of thought and behavior is the accepted basis of life, emotions are generally tightly reined within this structure.

The release to individualism—whether in the emergence of creative thinking in the Hebrew prophets or in early nineteenth-century experience—is typically accompanied by a renewal of appreciation of emotional values for the individual. Thus Hosea and Isaiah, Jesus and Paul, battled the fetters of priestly authoritarianism in order to free the individual creative religious spirit, just as later in different fields Rousseau, Wordsworth, Wagner, and Orozco asserted the rights of the natural man. From ancient times until today, fulfillment for all human beings, the abundant life, has been the supreme value for the prophet, the individualist, the apostle of democracy as opposed to the apotheosis of the canon, the “right” books of the authoritarian or priestly group. Thus education directed by the archons of the city is concerned with what is taught; while education in a democratic setting is concerned with who is taught, and how the student can be so taught as to live as abundantly as possible—that is, achieve the emotional and intellectual maturity that will make possible the fullest and wisest participation in the contemporary world.

From the point of view of the teacher of individually different students, all our heritage from the past as well as the creative work and the problems of the present constitute a curriculum from which material useful to a given student can be selected. We share with other teachers in liberal arts colleges the belief that records of human experience of the past may illuminate confused problems of the present and that understanding creative work of the past in our own and other cultures is a necessary part of understanding present creative work. The question remains whether it is the *Rig Veda*, the *New Testament*, *Marius the Epicurean*, *Paradise Lost*, or *The Magic Mountain* that will educate a given student at a given time; the answer depends on the answers to many questions regarding the ability, maturity, imagination, present problems and curiosity of the student. The answers to these questions are relevant to all teachers who

deeply hope that each learning exposure will "take," will be in fact a learning experience.

At a time when the confusions of a changing world are giving new stimulus to the effort to find an answer to educational questions a new authoritative curriculum or canon is a natural solution to seek. The question whether such uniformity in education can meet the needs of all students is one to be answered empirically; the data of this book, based on observations of students and how they learn, will be relevant. The time for growing up and for educating or learning to live fully and deeply is short; those who are concerned with students do not like to see any time lost on studies which have no value because the student is not ready for them. They want to find out what she *is* ready for.

Many teachers who wish to begin at the point where the student is and to furnish materials as they are needed naturally start with the student's "interests." It does not take much experience to discover that her interests as she states them are sometimes deep rooted and long-lived, sometimes volatile and of momentary value. Sometimes they are important at one stage but yield to other more important ones later. Sometimes they are potentially of permanent importance, but the student is unable to pursue them beyond the point where obstacles begin to arise.

We shall therefore find ourselves discussing the terms in which growth comes for different students and, quite specifically, the rhythms and sequences of learning which we need to evaluate accurately if we are going to help each student wisely. The fact that some students are quickly oriented, others very slowly; that students can sometimes cope later with work which presented too many anxieties the first time they tackled it; that growth stimulated by one course may be reflected in a general acceleration in the rest of the work; that students lose the gains they make and must undergo repeated readjustments before these gains can be considered deeply assimilated; that, when special difficulties appear in a

given field, work in a different area is sometimes better preparation for growth in the original field; that some students can do their best work only after personal problems have been solved, while others can work on their problems only after they have succeeded well in their work—these are conclusions drawn from careful, detailed analysis of teachers' records and are discussed at length in later chapters.

We shall also discuss problems that interfere with learning: problems of health, social life, or family difficulties which may stimulate learning in some students and interfere with it in others; problems in specific areas of work; problems of personality structure which affect all areas of a student's work and life. Whenever hypotheses are presented certain questions must always be raised: What is the relevant evidence? How does it relate to other knowledge? Is it in accordance with accepted facts?

The evidence offered here is almost entirely clinical in the sense that it consists of observations on students in the process of being educated; these observations were made by teachers who were unaware of the conclusions to be drawn in this study but who shared its general approach to learning. The conclusions here arrived at fit so well with clinical observations by psychiatrists and psychologists dealing with problems of adjustment that most of them will sound familiar and reasonable. They will also seem reasonable to experimental psychologists like Murray, Sanford, Allport, Sherif, Murphy, Rapaport, who have been experimentally demonstrating the relation of needs, autistic approaches, and emotional patterns to perception, memory, and other higher mental processes formerly considered independent of the affective life of the individual.

The writer has had extensive experience with preschool and elementary-school children of upper middle-class families. Such children show similar patterns of behavior and learning at all age levels, and in the case of 20 percent to 40 percent offer problems that need more attention than a

teacher of thirty children can give. These difficulties also lie back of many of the reading failures—as well as the failure to meet grade standards or to meet college entrance requirements—among children and young people whose ability, if ability were all that mattered, would insure success.

This field, which may be thought of as the field of affective or emotional factors in learning (or the relation between personality make-up and ways of learning), is relatively new. It does not undertake to answer all the unanswered questions about education which our generation is asking. But we believe that the task of educating individuals for mature living will be better carried out if we can put to work and test out the answers we do find as rapidly as they become clear.

When emotional factors in learning are seen to be important not only in problem cases but also in a large proportion—if not all—of the student body, guidance becomes a preoccupation of every day, rather than the subject of a semi-annual visit to the dean. In the following chapter we shall sketch some of the lines which guidance at this college has taken. This is not to be regarded as an inflexible outline of desirable procedure; from year to year external conditions (such as the present war, with its stimulus to accelerated work, earlier marriage, and zeal for jobs) and changes in the student body (such as a striking shift in average scholastic aptitude) may change the needs of students and hence the kinds of guidance required. Our discussion will therefore describe an approach that has developed out of our experience up to this time. We assume that, in such a rapidly changing period of education and of social life, concepts of guidance will develop along with awareness of student needs.

THE ROLE OF DIAGNOSIS IN EDUCATIONAL GUIDANCE

GENERAL EDUCATION as distinct from specific professional training is widely thought of as contributing to personality development. The right college can be as important to personality development as the right climate or the right diet or the right regimen is important to the health of a given individual. Yet in the field of matching the education to the needs of the individual we are a long way from the point we have reached in medicine and health. When we deal with students in terms of "pass or flunk out," we are at about the same stage medicine had reached when bloodletting and the application of leeches were the cure for most fevers. In the field of medicine and health we not only diagnose specific maladies as either acute or chronic and prescribe accordingly, but we also "build up" the run-down child; we anticipate potential difficulties and attempt to prevent them; we prescribe the regimen calculated to develop resistance, strength and the best health possible for each individual.

In the field of education there is a similar need for diagnosis as a basis for guidance of the personality development of the individual. We have begun to recognize certain syndromes (Munroe)¹ of educational psychopathology (Tiebout).² We have not yet reached the point where the routine annual checking discloses potential weaknesses that need special attention even though no acute educational malady is present. Nor have we reached the point where the personality make-up with its specific educational needs is diagnosed as a basis for educational planning except in superficial terms at the level of what the student asks for. To be sure, at a time

¹ See R. L. Munroe, *Teaching the Individual* (New York, 1942), p. 156.

² See H. M. Tiebout, "The Misnamed Lazy Student," *Educational Record*, April, 1943, p. 128.

when medicine is asserting that the wisdom of the body often dictates the food necessities of the child as accurately as the dietician does with her "balanced diet," we would do well to pause before urging our technically based recommendations against a student's clear wishes. Yet, as we shall see, the student's own hindsight may leave him regretful that insufficient direction was given. Many instances may be cited of the release through guidance of well-rooted preferences or interests that the student had originally been afraid to pursue.

If, then, we accept the possibility of educational guidance, not only in terms of anticipating likely failure and special difficulty but also in terms of understanding the basic needs of each student, what lines will such guidance follow?

We shall see how different for each individual are the processes of orientation to the new situation presented by college, the task of clarification of interests, and the patterns of development through college. The differences in patterns of growth in college are related to differences in patterns of physiological maturing, of reaction to the new methods and materials of college work, and to differences in the emotional needs and personality patterns which each student brings to college. Guidance of students will be guidance through these processes of adjustment and growth, and through the processes of learning to satisfy her needs, in order that she may become a self-sustaining person.

At the simplest level, guidance is concerned with helping the student to plan her education in relation to her own needs, to choose her field of work, her teachers; to achieve her objective, to work through difficulties as they arise. Guidance of the student as a person whose life is only partly concerned with study varies with the desires and needs of the individual. Those who are eager for the opportunity to work out their problems in their own way are largely permitted to do so, unless they run into difficulties or seek advice; those who want help on problems may get it from teacher, adviser, or

psychiatrist. As with young adults in any college, the sources of problems are many: marriage plans, and other questions concerning men friends; the weaning from parents; room-mates and college friends; planning time as between work and social life; courses and teachers; orientation to life after college in work and community life. Many courses in literature, social science, psychology, and biology deal with various aspects of sex and reproduction, marriage, family life, and relations between people. Such courses provide factual data, points of view which the student can use in clarifying her own dilemmas. The task of guidance is to help her consider more fully the implications of facts relevant to her own problem, and to work through conflicts that interfere with her effort to come to a satisfactory conclusion. Our ultimate aim is not to provide ready-made decisions for her, but to help her learn how to solve her own difficulties and how to achieve the security and freedom to live in terms of her own decisions. It will be clear from the following chapters that part of the adviser's task is learning in what terms and in what areas of life different students can achieve such freedom and decisiveness, and what kind of help will be needed in other areas.

Any guidance, then, must be based upon either formal or informal diagnosis of the character and needs of each student and the situation in which each student finds herself. What are the patterns of growth to be expected of her; what materials and methods of work will be helpful; what needs must be met before stable interests can emerge; what problems lie between her and her best development?

We cannot go far in such diagnosis without considering the world she will live in after she finishes college. Whatever universal transformations are brought by the inevitable postwar changes, there will be unique conditions in the community where she lives as an individual. Her application of the social-science work undertaken at college and the problems to which it is applied will be different if she returns

to Alabama from those she would face if she went to San Francisco or Denver or New York. We need to evaluate as best we can both the war and the postwar conditions as well as possible local factors, so as to help her toward the most adequate education for her.

A glance at the subsequent activities of Sarah Lawrence students may also help: they are serving as members of the armed services at home and abroad; workers in industry in operational, subengineering, or personnel jobs; in government offices and bureaus. Others are in their own communities in such varied occupations as social service worker, occupational therapist, nurse; writer, editor, reporter; columnist for publishing houses, magazines, newspapers, advertising agencies, or free lance; teachers in nursery, grade, and high schools, and in colleges; department store workers in styling, personnel work, in charge of mail orders, and specialty shop; operating a bookshop; secretary, bank cashier, clerical worker; director of publicity in a college; artist, musician, photographer, actress, dancer, museum worker. A very large proportion in addition carry volunteer work in the various agencies in their own communities. Thirteen percent of those who have taken the degree have gone on in graduate study, three are in medical school. More than a third of these have taken advanced degrees. In short, students from a college which has always encouraged study of reality and educational orientation to social change do not surprise their teachers when they turn up in a wide variety of types of work.

We know that a large proportion of our students will marry and marry young. Reports from married graduates have often told of stimulating collaboration with husband in fields as varied as farming, newspaper publishing, and work in Latin-American relations. Marriage may provide a satisfying base for participation in the community; undoubtedly the war-time stimulus to community activities increases this trend. We know also that a large number of them will probably have one or more children within ten years after leaving col-

lege. If common-sense observation can tell us anything at all, some of these girls like children and some of them do not. Some of them have looked forward since early childhood to the thrill of the first baby; to others having a baby is incidental, something almost any woman may do, important, to be sure, but not the biggest event in a lifetime. Among those who do not get married (as early as the others), responsibilities for parents may demand quite as much insight into human relations and quite as much ability to maintain independent interests along with loyal attention to one's family.

"Guidance to what?" then, means, ordinarily, guidance to some base of independent life as an individual and to some perspective and insight into the human relations that participation in any kind of family and social life involve. This sounds simple enough. Actually each one of these two goals is a challenge to the teacher and the administration. In what terms can "some base of independent life" come for each student? With which student can we build upon a strong balanced maturity, or clear definite interests, or marked abilities? How do we guide a student who is immature, who has spotty abilities and conflicting interests?

Part of the answer is suggested by the discussion of the following chapters. We shall find that among tight, overcontrolled, rigid students, some have found release in art, some in music, some in creative writing, some in working with children or other groups of people. We found that the same teacher could be very helpful to one student, useless to another. In either instance the value of the materials or of the work of the teacher as a person depends not only upon the intrinsic objective qualifications of the materials and the teacher but also upon their value for the particular student who is exposed to them; and this, in turn, depends on the needs and the readiness of response characteristic of the student at the time she meets these materials or this teacher. It is, therefore, desirable to find methods of diagnosis for every

student which will help to prescribe the appropriate materials, the right teaching personality and methods. This means not only early recognition of the character structure of the student, but an understanding of the basis of the pattern and its probable limits of flexibility.

In one case, for instance, a superficial, flighty student was not merely described as highly extraverted, but the test suggested that her persistent skimming of the surface reflected a deep unconscious fear of what might happen if she paused to look more closely. In other cases, similar flightiness was evaluated more optimistically as a sign of immaturity which might be expected to disappear. Of two overconscientious students addicted to a slavish clinging to high-school methods of learning, one showed on the test as a genuine pedant and the other as a very creative person capable of mature work once she learned more self-confidence in a free situation.

Distinctions of this sort would need to be made in any of the groups or types of students we shall discuss. We shall presently note different levels of shyness, different roots of shyness, and different degrees of responsiveness of shy students to approaches used at college. Without the help of a test it took a year to discover that beneath the shyness of one student was a wealth of originality and unique creative power that would one day come to expression; two years to substantiate the hunch that the shy conscientious work of another student covered a sensitive perception and awareness which with encouragement could be strengthened enough to give her a firm base and self-confidence; the same test also disclosed that N.M.'s reserve covered weaknesses much deeper and more serious than appeared at first. In contrast to all of these it was found after months of teaching, although it probably could have been discovered earlier by careful Rorschach diagnosis,³ that D.A.'s shyness and that of a number of other girls like her was a part of her reaction to being

³ R. Munroe, "Use of the Rorschach Method in College Guidance," *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, VII (1943), 90.

transplanted from a very different background, and a matter of temporary readjustment rather than a deeply rooted pattern of behavior.

When the pattern of behavior is clearly defined, the curricular prescription is often obvious; but, when the prescription is not clear, trial and error is no more hazardous than is the typical required curriculum which ignores individual differences.

Making Use of Diagnostic Data

The first step in diagnosis is insightful observation of whatever behavior, work products, expression of attitudes are available to the teacher in the set-up in which she is working, and an analysis of whatever tests are feasible to use. What do these observations add up to, and what use does the teacher make of them? Of course, hundreds of careful observations will mean nothing at all unless they are integrated into usable hypotheses about the student. These hypotheses will take the form of answers to such questions as:

What are the characteristic types of questions this student asks or the type of material she gravitates toward?

What are her characteristic ways of working and what purpose do these serve for her?

What does she appear to want from a teacher?

The answers to these first questions about what the teacher has observed point toward answers to the underlying questions:

What have I learned about the kind of person she is? and is likely to become? What role or roles is she likely to play in the dynamically changing years ahead?

How do the interests and goals she expresses at this point fit with her kind of person? Can her probable abilities sustain them? Will these interests or goals prove sufficient challenge to stimulate her growth?

What aspects of her personality can be counted on to keep her in the pursuit of these goals, and what obstacles is she likely to confront within herself?

What can the college contribute to the fullest development of her strengths, and the overcoming of some of her weaknesses? What materials, methods of work, personalities in the college are likely to be most helpful to her development?

These broad problems will have to be considered on the basis of information collected in answer to specific questions such as these: Looking at a person from the point of view of present areas of fulfillment do her most zestful satisfactions come from sensory areas (auditory as in music, tactual as in sculpture, visual as in painting, drawing, design), manipulatory or mechanical, verbal, athletic, or social areas? What do these mean to her? Are they based on special skill in these areas, or upon family values, or are they substitutes for known or unknown frustrations, or upon some combination of these?

What areas of dissatisfaction, insecurity or resistance does she have? Are these built on lack of elementary skill, conflict over too high standards, lack of exposure or information, family disapproval, or what combination of these?

What potential areas of satisfaction does she have? Does she have many elements, for instance, of an artistic gift, which have never been released? Does she have potential insight in dealing with people, which could be developed if she were freed from the traumatizing effects of certain experiences?

Clues to potential abilities and satisfactions may be derived from the Rorschach test when it is completely analyzed, or from observations of a student's work. One student firmly resisted the idea of a course in art in her freshman year. Her autobiography, observations of children and people, and other reports were always full of fresh observations, rich sensory impressions with a predominantly visual quality. She welcomed an opportunity to study the life histories of a group of artists, through this got over a feeling of lack of ability to work with art media, and a year later gained great satisfaction from being able to enter and work in a course in design.

A gift for keen observation and inference, coupled with good scores on the analogy test of the A.C.E. may be clues to a potential gift for science that has been blocked by earlier bad teaching or by a sense of inferiority to a more scientifically gifted older brother.

How do the interests and goals expressed accord with the personality? One girl wishes to get a Ph.D. and become a clinical psychologist. Her test scores show very poor abilities in all the scientific areas, coupled with a high degree of intuition, and an extremely emotional, excited, tense approach to people. At present she lacks the stability and caution needed for a sound clinical approach: her growth will need to be watched closely. Will she be able to develop more scientific competence than is indicated by her test? Will she become a more objective person whose intensity is mellowed to a warmth that would be clinically valuable? If this goal should not be encouraged, what other plans would be possible for her?

Another student wanted at first to be a newspaper reporter. In view of her high intelligence, deep and turbulent feelings, and insecurity in many social situations, it seemed uncertain that this role would do justice to her potentialities. It was suggested that she hold her plans in abeyance while working as deeply as possible in social science, psychology and literature, letting her specific plans emerge after she had tested her abilities in different areas. What aspects of her personality can be counted on to keep her in the pursuit of these goals, and what obstacles is she likely to confront within herself? We shall see in the studies of Louise, Priscilla, and others, how great assets can be so balanced by anxieties and strains that a consistent line of development is virtually impossible for a student. These liabilities function differently for different students. Do they challenge or discourage her? Does she evade or try to conquer them?

What can the college contribute? Here we have to clarify hypotheses regarding the terms in which she learns; the con-

ditions under which she learns; the functions, for her learning processes, of reading, observation, class discussion, conference with her teachers. How does she use her teachers, her adviser? What is the relation of all these and other aspects of the learning situation in college to the out-of-college learning experiences to which she is exposed? What is the function of college work for her, in relation to the rest of her college life? Must it provide an area of security in a strange new situation, an isle of safety? Or does she look to her work for recognition? Or is it a source of anxiety in contrast to a good social adjustment in college? Is it a necessary step toward earning a living? Or a way of proving that she is grown up or growing up?

Granted the "characteristic trend" of response to materials, methods of work, teacher-personalities, what range of flexibility or variability of response does this student show? The points at which such flexibility or change occurs may be most useful to the teacher in working ahead with a student.

Questions Regarding Curricular Guidance

Through the years during which the college has been maturing in its conception of guidance, certain questions have come up repeatedly. Some of them are as follows:

Should a student be free to change her adviser when she wishes?

How sound is it to adapt the program to what a student "can take" at a given time?

How wise is it to permit a student to "specialize" in one area as much as she likes?

How sound is it to let her build a program in terms of a general education with little or no specialization?

Should exploratory work be confined to freshman year?

At the third- and fourth-year level should not a student's work consist chiefly of "advanced" work?

All of these questions imply that the question, "Should a student be allowed to do chiefly what she wants to do?" has been already answered with something other than an unqualified yes. Many reasons for qualifications will be appar-

ent from the following chapters, but certain points deserve special spotlighting here.

In the discussions of 1935 to 1939, Dr. Caroline Zachry emphasized the point that guidance which was directed primarily toward making the student comfortable and happy at the right moment might prove to betray her subsequent development, since it could very well fixate neurotic patterns of retreat from difficulties instead of helping her to face them. There would be times when a student should be helped to "see through," or to "take," a course or program which she wished to drop. Similarly if her adviser were following a line in guidance which the student found distasteful, the student's resistance, even if carried to the point of wishing to change advisers or to avoid conferences with the adviser, should not necessarily be considered an adequate basis for a change. This is so axiomatic in clinical and psychiatric circles that if any clinician happened to read this he would doubtless be amazed that the question could even be asked. It has been asked, of course, in the context of the approach here, which did not begin with, but only slowly came to include, some of the insights and concepts of clinical work. While from the outset the college has had a deep respect for the individual as she is, with her desires and abilities and limitations, it has grown toward an approach more clearly directed by respect for what the individual student may become, if her present abilities and limitations and desires are guided through her years at college. The criterion then is never "What does she want?" or even "Can she 'take it'?" but "What is our best guess about the direction in which she is heading and what will best help her to achieve progress in the right direction for her?" By and large, expecting and encouraging a student to stretch a bit from time to time is more likely to contribute to growth than letting her keep within the limits of what she can handle without stretching; expecting her to "work through" difficult pieces of the road will ultimately help her

more than letting her retrace steps till she finds a more smoothly paved avenue to follow.

"Specialization" may serve a "safety" function or a stretching function, depending on the student. So may the broad general education. We shall note that some of the students hardest to budge out of a chosen pattern were most sorry at the end of the senior year that they had been allowed to do as they wished. They had worked hard and well, but within limits of their own choosing and they wished they had "been made" to do something different. It is of course equally true the other students resented being "shoved" into courses that had no meaning for them. There is no way of avoiding some risk of failures in guidance; certainly avoiding the effort to help a student get outside of the limits set by her need for security is no guarantee of her later appreciation of her adviser.

This does not mean that questions of preference, the student's feeling of safety and comfort, are to be ignored. Often a plan is made to provide one or two areas of security with an understanding teacher or in which the student is at ease, and one area of exploration or of new methods of work. If she is sufficiently comfortable in all the rest of her work, even a very insecure student can usually be helped to see the potential value of the new or even dangerous area.

The questions regarding the desirability of undertaking elementary work in a new field in the third and fourth year involve both the quality and the quantity of work. The importance of the opportunity to explore new fields even late in one's college career has been assumed in part of the discussion just above; in most colleges this is handled by having the student enter the appropriate beginning course. At Sarah Lawrence this procedure is often unsatisfactory, since, if the student has actually matured during the preceding two or three years, she is ready for concepts and a tempo not appropriate for freshmen or younger beginners. This has led to the

repeated requests for "exploratory courses" in various fields for advanced students. From here on the problem is primarily an administration problem of planning a curriculum so as to provide both specialized and exploratory work at both immature and more mature levels.

Questions Arising in the Adviser's Role

In a recent meeting of teachers and advisers, "old teachers" discussed with "new dons" or advisers their experience with the work of the dons at Sarah Lawrence. In this meeting the predominant emphasis was on the relationship between don and "donee." Three chief bases of this relationship were singled out for separate emphasis.

That spontaneous genuine rapport is a necessary basis for a good relationship. This implied that an adviser could not effectively help a student whom he disliked or by whom he was disliked. That because of the strangeness of much of the new experience of college to many students, the adviser's effort to share the interests of the student, to get on the same ground with the student socially is an important way to lay a foundation for the student's respect and willingness to discuss problems as they arise. That the adviser can learn most from watching the student's spontaneous responses to various ideas and experiences presented in the course.

There was some discussion on this occasion and there has been further discussion on other occasions about the indispensability of each of these approaches to the guidance relationship of the don. The more training in guidance a teacher has, the more reliance he is apt to place on the objective understanding of the student's needs and problems, with relatively less emphasis on "liking" the student as a necessary condition to helping her. The use of social experiences as an avenue to rapport occurs more readily if the teacher is versatile enough to enjoy the social activities students enjoy; the insight gained from observing students' responses to work experiences varies with the range of experiences available in

different courses. Hence, in practice the relative emphasis varies with the personality of the individual adviser.

An adviser's relation with one student may take the form of encouragement, protection, praise, the giving of warmth or recognition; with another student, challenge and criticism may predominate; with another specific detailed directions or the training in techniques of study may be most important; with another, very little guidance may be given—the student has a free hand and is expected to show results; with another, “kidding along,” not-too-serious criticism, may be most effective. One student may respond earnestly to an idealistic approach and an appeal to potentialities that another student would laugh at.

Questions which arise explicitly or implicitly when guidance rests upon a personal relationship with an adviser include the following:

Under what circumstances does admiration, praise, deliberate patting on the back help a student? Can it help her even when it produces a regression to a childlike attitude of dependence on parental acceptance and approval?

Under what circumstances is a student helped by a symbolic “spanking”—disapproval, scolding, refusing to be kidded or to kid, firmness in a plan which is distasteful to her?

When a strong positive relation has been built up, when it is desirable to “wean” the student or “break the transference” and to what sort of relationship? Should weaning always occur before she leaves college? Does weaning involve dissolving the friendship?

The answers to these questions will depend on the personality of the teacher as well as upon his training. Some teachers will find a relatively passive and reassuring approach more congenial to their temperament and abilities; some are more resourceful and subtle in using indirect methods of leading a student to see for herself what another teacher may point out directly. Some teachers may prefer to produce certain results in behavior alone, without attempting to work through

the problem verbally to the end that a student understands what is happening to her. Usually a teacher will not wish to use direct, reality-facing methods unless he feels secure in handling any antagonism that may arise, and unless he feels confident that the student has built up enough security in the college so that a threat or feeling of anxiety in one area will not be too disturbing to her.

Whenever teachers first become aware of the fact that life is hard on the young (as well as on themselves perhaps, since any study of the teachers would show work going ahead against the same odds of physical difficulty, family anxiety, economic strain), they are apt to grow unduly tender and tolerant. They may conclude that reassurance and relief from anxiety are the most important things a teacher can give a student. The most superficial acquaintance will show that this is by no means what the students always want. "Something to carry you out of yourself," "something to sit down on" are freshman phrases to describe a need for definite content. While many students are at times too deeply entrenched in personal problems to give their clearest thought to work, these same students may be the first to complain if faculty do not "maintain high standards"; they seem to realize that the objective pressure toward work may help to give perspective to problems of a personal nature, and that satisfaction in work can form a backdrop of security and give poise and courage for the solution of personal problems. In a small number of cases security in work is direct release and leads to greater security in other relationships. In a small number of cases, also, it must be admitted, work provides an escape which may postpone the necessity for facing problems.

When a teacher is aware of serious, personal student problems, before she can give any intelligent guidance she must be in a position to judge the problem not only in terms of valid alternatives and her own capacity to help, but in terms of its total weight in the life and work of the student: whether she "can take" the responsibility of a solution on her own; how

she is going to use any help she is given; to what extent, if at all, work should be slighted in order to facilitate solving another problem; or whether solving work problems will of itself increase the likelihood of solving others. Clarity of function between teachers is important; when teachers become aware of possibilities of guidance it is often possible to jeopardize good advice by permitting it to come from too many sources at once. Sometimes teachers may duplicate work on the same problem whereas a division of labor, with one teacher concentrating on specific work problems and another working on specific personal problems, would be more effective.

Thus, the answer also depends partly on the student. Passive reassuring techniques on the part of the adviser are most apt to be helpful if the student is basically integrated and has a relatively superficial problem of accumulated tension or feeling for which she has no release, or if there is superficial shyness or insecurity which can be helped by encouragement to go ahead on her own terms and to express her desires as they arise. Similarly, passive "security-giving" reassurance is of little or no help when a basic structure in the student's personality is lacking, that is, when the student is highly disorganized and scattered, or when the conflicts are so deep as to cause a confusion and anxiety that drive the student too compulsively in one direction. In the former instance the student may profit from being given a clear structure that will enable her disorganized impulses to move more coherently. In the latter instance, if therapeutic help is available it may be most desirable in resolving the conflicts; if such help is not available, insight can sometimes come through guided reading and discussion.

Passive approaches to guidance may seem to run fewer risks from the point of view of the teacher. Sometimes the student's stay in college is uncertain. Will she remain one, two, or four years? If she is likely to stay only one year, should the effort be directed solely toward stabilizing what is most

sound from her earlier development, or should as much stimulus as possible be given in the short time available? It is not easy to judge whether a girl's fixed pattern of goals and ideals is artificial or deep-rooted, and is therefore difficult to determine what is involved in stimulating her to revise them. When her values appear to be limited, and to resist all normal stimulus to expansion, it is not easy to know whether this is due ultimately to a fear of the mother, a fear of the unknown, a compensation for weakness, or simply a clearly formulated set of values. In the face of all these uncertainties, passive guidance, which sets forth new possibilities without an overt attack upon the students' values or plans leaves the job of growth up to the student, assuming that she will respond as she is ready to respond, and the more freely without being forced.

Active approaches are justified in terms of the problems. Since time may be short, we cannot waste it by waiting for a slow growth that may not occur unless it is sharply stimulated. Growth comes not only through sun and rain but also by grafting, heavy fertilization, transplanting, and other active procedures. True, any of these may damage or ruin certain plants, but it would be folly to lose the growth possible for the majority because of possible damage to a few.

The solution of specific problems whether connected with work, friends, sex, or parents is hopeful compared with working on deeper character trends that represent long-time results of organic and environmental factors in growth. When specific problems seem to be interrelated and rooted in personality structure, a diagnosis of potentialities within the structure and of the degree of elasticity of the structure becomes necessary before help can be given on specific problems.

In the case of constrained conscientious students, greater release and spontaneity, more freedom to be oneself, to discover one's own wishes and values may well come first in the relatively safe areas of work and subsequently lead to greater

freedom in personal relations. One might add that a teacher probably runs the least amount of risk by adopting this procedure, because the overconscientious student in our experience does not often misuse advice in the direction of greater release; if there is any change at all, such a student profits from greater naturalness and spontaneity. Here "standards" of work must be recast in terms of demand for genuineness; otherwise, suggestions will be useless.

Since constraint and overconscientiousness are often a result of acceptance of status standards from early authorities, these character trends may be "loosened up" through rapport with rich personalities who possess both fine standards and a warm spontaneity. An experience of this kind is, of course, not confined to any one college, but has been the joy of students for generations who have known the generous response of a William James, a Mark Hopkins, or a Carleton Parker. Such a contribution to the student in terms of teaching personality is often ignored in the contemporary pattern of university education, in which research determines recognition but often stifles creative teaching.

Frequently, the overconscientious student sensitive to standards will also respond to new sanctions for new values, and to this end materials selected for their own intrinsic quality of creativeness and spontaneity in terms of explicit defense of values of spiritual and personal freedom will give content and reinforcement to indirect or direct suggestions from teachers.

In the case of scattered students whose scatter is actually rooted in deep anxiety the teacher's risks are greater. Reassurance is always needed in plenty. We know from studies of this kind of child at many other age levels that severe discipline aggravates the insecurity. But the student needs any objective basis of confidence she can get from work well done, and often needs the external help of a clear pattern imposed by the institution or the adviser. The problems of this group can scarcely be avoided: most of the students talk

about them—in fact throw them in the lap of a teacher. Yet if the teacher or adviser is not experienced enough to see several steps ahead toward solutions actually available (a rare thing for these students to do), discussion may actually increase anxiety. The essential thing for this group is to get a well-rounded picture of potentialities or success in college work in any terms, and to have a clear plan for guidance in college, or, if the student does not succeed in college, an equally well thought-out plan for work or activity elsewhere. In any case these students are the least likely to succeed in terms of work or relationship that call for continuity of sustained attention, and the farther they get in college the less likely they are to meet usual academic criteria on term papers or projects. Success came for Anne, Dotty, and others of this group in recitals or other situations which mobilized drive to do one's best for an audience. Concrete dramatic pieces of work such as case studies, personality comparisons, analyses of novels and biographies were assignments with which Anne, Sonia, Charlotte, and other students like them succeeded easily, with an exhibition of insight satisfying to the teacher and with a sense of achievement reassuring to the student. In no case we know did this kind of work have "therapeutic value" for the student comparable to the release gained by the conscientious type of student, unless the much needed reassurance of success is taken seriously.

Both in the case of the overconstrained student and in the case of the scattered student we have been discussing those whose guidance confronts generalized patterns of personality so pervasive as to make any permanent help with specific problems dependent upon help with the basic general problem first. In the case of other students, we have noted that generalized patterns may not be so deeply rooted. This is clearest when we find variable patterns, a well-balanced integration of intelligence and emotional response most of the time, with occasional periods of constraint or scatter at times

of insecurity such as entrance into a new institution or a new class.

In this instance, taking the weakness seriously and accepting it may lead to fixing it unnecessarily; on the contrary, offering clear patterns and standards, making realistic demands that do not play down to the student may encourage her to feel that the teacher has confidence in her and expects her to work through what is assumed to be a temporary period of maladjustment. Her own sense of the teacher's firm belief in the temporary character of her maladjustment helps her to accept it as temporary and releases her to expand as soon as she feels intellectually clear about the situation and her relation to it.

Teaching as Guidance

All good teaching is therapeutic, if by therapeutic we mean that the individual has been freed from blocks and inhibitions that interfere with response to new ideas or problems, or has gained control of excessive responsiveness that led to disorganized or confused thinking. Most teaching, however, attempts to accomplish so much in so short a time that the task of helping students toward a better integration of spontaneous responses and intellectual control becomes secondary to acquiring new facts, special techniques necessary in a specific field of work, or turning out required pieces of finished work.

Some courses by their own nature are more adaptable to certain purposes of guidance than others. Among those which may have an important release value for certain students are: Singing, dancing, painting, work with children, field work involving work with people directly rather than detailed research, certain kinds of laboratory work that take on the value of a craft.

One problem that arises when a course is recommended for its value to the student emotionally is that if the student

has little ability for it she may not be able to meet high standards for work even though the course is of great importance to her and is much appreciated. At this point the conflict between an emphasis on growth and upon "achievement" may become acute and may confuse both the student and the teacher.

When teachers are handling courses from a guidance point of view, they make flexible use of the course in so far as possible at the following points:

Organization of the group: when students are too inhibited to participate freely in a large group, it may be necessary to break the group into smaller units for discussion or field observation. Group assignments, field observation, as well as special contracts and reading for the individual student may be designed to provide indirect or direct approaches to problems of individual students.

Conference time is often used to discuss implications, important only to the individual student, of material used by the group.

Sections of a course may be planned for specific remedial purposes: training in reading, writing, organization of data; more spontaneous expression of attitudes and feelings about material under discussion; interpretation of concepts and hypotheses with observations; integration of attitudes with conclusions.

Thus, when the teacher's desire is to help a student approach a problem which is partly repressed or evaded, she may draw upon either remote or directly connected material in the social sciences. For example, when a student is sensitive or has a severe conflict about aggression or sex or relations with parents, the dynamite within the problem may be rendered harmless by approaching it with material remote from the student:

Anthropological discussions of cultural variations in aggression or sex behavior.

Historical changes in pattern in our culture related to the student's problem.

Varying approaches to the problem in novels, current articles in newspapers, the *Readers Digest*, and so on.

Observations of nursery-school children's rebellion against pa-

rental authority, aggression toward each other, sex speculations and curiosity.

Materials provided for this objective and indirect discussion may sometimes lead to a direct attack on her own problem by the student, who now has more material with which to build her point of view; or the indirect attack may relieve her anxiety enough so that she can approach her teacher or adviser or the college psychiatrist for help.

When the student's problem is one of need for more spontaneity, certain courses may stimulate this in the fashion of Moreno's spontaneity-training; students are given practice in acting out roles with criticism from their own age groups. Practice in how to talk to and play with children or interview adults gives a real orientation to problems of communication and rapport with people. Acting out situations in which one is confronted with a shy or frightened child, a resistant or domineering adult, can lead to insight into and understanding of the feelings that lead to such behavior both in others and in oneself.

In the therapeutic use of teaching, the teacher keeps in mind the different results hoped for with different students. With each student according to her need, this will involve an effort toward providing for specific experiences of achievement, or releasing spontaneous insight, or encouraging freer expression of feelings, or establishing a relationship of confidence with an adult, or achieving a more organized approach to work. It implies that education consisting of release for one person and better organization for another is therapy.

Use of the Psychiatrist

How the college psychiatrist fits into the picture of guidance needs of the student will depend on who the psychiatrist is, the amount of time at his disposal, the types of problems he handles and his values; as well as the attitude of teachers toward him; and the need of the student, her resistance or readiness for his special kind of help. Sometimes the psychia-

trist can take up where the teacher or adviser leaves off, after a period of preparation which makes it possible for the student to overcome her anxiety about consulting him; sometimes, through consultations, the psychiatrist helps the teacher to see the implications of possible ways of dealing with the behavior of the student; sometimes he simply sends the teacher back for further observations needed to clarify the attitudes of the student. With a small number of cases he either assumes the task of long-term therapy, if he has time, or arranges for therapy with an outside psychiatrist.

The psychiatrist is apt to be thought of as the last resort when severe problems arise, just as the pioneer called a doctor only when his child or friend was in the throes of severe agony. Today, mothers take for granted a monthly check-up of the baby by the pediatrician, a semiannual check-up of the rest of the family by the doctor and dentist. Medicine has become preventive. Educators begin to see that they have a similar opportunity; since the psychiatrist is the specialist who best understands behavior and motivation, he will in the future be the indispensable consultant not just for the problem child of school and college, but for every student. His insight, along with the data provided by qualitative analysis of test results, will contribute to the diagnosis of educational needs, the prescriptions for dealing with them, as well as treatment of those students whose needs cannot be met by group and individual teaching alone.

The Student Work Committee

The Student Work Committee of this college consists of the director of education, the psychiatrist, and three faculty members elected by the faculty. It is the central authority responsible for final guidance decisions, approval of programs, acceptance for return, and approval of diplomas and degrees. The character of its discussions will be apparent from the individual studies in Part II. These discussions are by no means confined to students who are failing, but on the

contrary are equally given to the consideration of the direction of work, types of growth, and areas of difficulty of excellent and of average students. Whenever there is disagreement between a student's adviser and her faculty or between both of them and the student, or between the girl's teachers and the Committee, a discussion between teachers and the Committee is held. If certain questions recur frequently, the Student Work Committee may plan a meeting with the whole faculty; in such a meeting, cases are presented in detail and issues are thrashed out. Sometimes no clear-cut agreement regarding policy emerges, but an educational problem has been illuminated. Records of the discussions as well as teachers' notes on students form the basis for the following chapters. Because the problem of interests was central when the college began its study of education in terms of individual students, it is with interests that we shall proceed in the next chapter.

INTERESTS AND MOTIVATION

EXPERIENCED TEACHERS are by no means concerned solely or even primarily with the abilities, interests, or personality development of the student *as seen by the student*. One might almost say that they often regard the interests of each student as the point of departure for the development of insights, the capacity to analyze and reflect, the attitudes of tolerance or appreciation which they assume to be the desired result of education. Although difficulties in analyzing or generalizing, and obstacles to sympathy or appreciation may have little to do with the student's initial interests and purposes, nevertheless they may block the goals which faculty consider important to "learning" as seen in their terms.

These terms are always bipolar in reality: at one end is the student with her immediate desires and capacities for response; at the other end is the image of the mature, independent, socially minded or discriminating, creative or skillful citizen, which the teacher hopes each student may become. The discrepancy between these two pictures led, very early in the growth of this college, to a reevaluation of the meaning of "interests." Teachers who attempt to reorient the work of students in terms of motivation are likely to find themselves bogged down or confused by the paradox that doing what one is interested in may at one time be the greatest stimulus to growth and at another time the greatest obstacle to growth, or the more disturbing paradox that some students are unable to follow an interest at all. Thus it is worth while to begin with the problem of interests and see where it led in the effort to evaluate the relation of a student's interests to her ways of learning and of maturing.

At the end of the first five years of experience of the Sarah Lawrence faculty, frequent reference can be noted to "needs" which sustained or interfered with the student's effective pursuit of her interests. Underlying both these terms, the notion

—vague, frustrating, absurd but fundamental—of the “whole personality of the student” controlled most of the development of thinking about freshman guidance, and corrected many of the superficial efforts stemming from too great confidence in specific demands of the student. The “whole student” is the individual girl with her ambitions, her tastes, her strengths and weaknesses, who has led us to analyze what we mean by “interests,” “needs,” and growth at the college level.

The shift from reliance upon the student’s *stated* interests to the analysis of her educational needs in relation to her total development marks a shift to a “diagnostic basis” for curriculum planning for the individual. Just as a physician listens to a patient’s recital of symptoms, then formulates his conception of the underlying disease process in his diagnosis, the teacher or counselor takes into account everything the student can tell him, but looks for underlying trends that will be important in predicting probable future developments. Diagnosis of this sort searches for the probable consequences of this or that type of curricular plan for each student. It implies a type of evaluation concerned with the question: Did this plan bring the hoped for development? It is primarily interested in the effect of the course upon the student.

Abilities Do Not Always Determine Interests

We often assume that capacities virtually determine interests. This happens, however, only under certain conditions. If a girl has a definite “talent” and has enjoyed the use of it in a satisfactory family or group environment, further development of the talent is likely to be a natural focus for interest. One student, whom we shall call Faith, did not, however, grow up in such an environment. Definitely gifted in art, particularly in a decorative direction, she was one of an aristocratic and snobbish family accustomed to patronize art workers and artists. Longing for an objective focus for her energies and thoroughly dissatisfied with the emptiness of the society calendar, she wanted and needed an “interest.”

Yet she could not cut through the ties that bound her to the family attitudes. She could not be "a worker," and she never (now five years out of college) developed a stable interest. Another student's capacity met a different obstacle. Gifted and genuinely interested in writing, her need was for a home, a husband and a child—soon. This was not a conventional need to marry because all the other girls were getting married, but a deep need for a context of wholeness, for a complete home of her own, to supplant the badly broken one from which she had come to college. Only after this need had been met was she emotionally free for the intellectual and creative development that would bear fruit in writing.

Even where abilities are clear, the particular slant which they take may come from a basic personality trend. At the beginning of the year one freshman said, in discussing her work in dramatics, "I like the giving-orders part," while another was not at all interested in directing, but enjoyed backstage properties work where social demands were at a minimum and the satisfaction of a product from the work of her hands was at a maximum.

Where Do Interests Come From?

Initial conferences with freshmen before registration disclosed varied sources for the interests they expressed a desire to pursue. Ten years ago Hitler's activities had already accentuated perennial interest in race prejudice; and the Roosevelts may have been as responsible as anyone for the zeal for field trips. Thomas Mann had stimulated increased dinner-table discussion of psychological themes and personalities. "Problem" siblings and problem parents are always responsible for many questions about "adjustment" and the favorite "I want to find out how people get to be the way they are."

Most girls did not really take science "because we live in a technological era, and because it is important to understand basic mechanical and technological processes," but because of conscious or unconscious identification with Uncle Will who was a doctor, or a strong feeling that science

was something you could "sit down on" with a comforting sense of security. Few students indeed took psychology because of any interest in its contribution to broad present-day problems; but many took it for personal reasons. A desire to participate intelligently in current dinner-table conversations may lead to the wish to find out about the Oedipus complex or to understand the arguments for and against labor unions. One student wants to continue the study of French or "math," begun in high school, because it lends a familiar note in a strange new atmosphere; another says that she doesn't know yet, she'd like to try out different things and find out; or she'd like to take the same literature course her roommate is taking, or politics with that nice man who was so easy to talk to.

Many combinations of these attitudes underlie the interests of students in art. While the more mature students might express a wish to understand modern art or the conceptions of different artists through the ages, others might express in such naive terms as these their desire to express themselves or to communicate through art: "I want to learn about things that are beautiful"; "It is fun to work with my hands"; "I can tell other people some things better through paint or clay than any other way"; "I don't like these bizarre ugly modern ideas"; "I want to paint what I see and feel."

Those interested in the social scene reveal a similar variety of attitudes: one student may be eager to learn everything, while another may resist all learning and still another may seek through education the answer to specific questions of her own. "All my life my family have kept me from really seeing the other side of things. . . . I want to see where the unemployed live . . . and find out what they eat and wear." "I'll go ahead and take economics but I won't let them tell me what to think." "Maybe economics can tell me why things work the way they do . . . why so many people are so poor when we have more gold than any other country in the world."

The desire to share or keep up with a fiancé, a brother, or a roommate may give rise to specific or general interest in a

certain field. Unconscious problems which she could not face directly guided Joyce into literature and away from psychology. Other students were led into psychology by conscious problems for which no satisfactory conclusion had been reached. Sometimes the vague conflicts reflected in the first conferences with faculty suggested a course.

If these illustrations make it appear that the interests of most students are fortuitous, superficial, and temporary, such a conclusion is not justified. A quantitative study of the interests which students brought to college as compared with those acquired there will throw the discussion into proper relief. Dr. Lillian Dick made such a study to determine the extent to which the interests of incoming students as expressed in the student's application for admission to the college were 1) permanent; 2) satisfied by present curriculum; or 3) modified by causes unknown.

A comparison was made between the interests expressed on Form A and the curriculum which the students followed. The curriculum was divided into five faculties—Social Science, Natural Science, Arts, Literature, Language. This order is followed in tables below. Three symbols were used to denote the relationship between Form A and the courses taken.

X. An expressed interest which was followed up from the Application Form through the second year.

Y. An unexpressed interest, or a new interest stimulated here.

Z. An expressed interest which was not followed up.

Arts, literature and social science each constituted about 30 percent of the course elections; science received 7 percent and language just under 5 percent. During the second

TABLE A

Course Choices of Students Completing 2 years

	<i>1st year</i>	<i>2d year</i>
Social Science	30.3	29.7
Natural Science	6.9	11.0
Arts	29.0	26.9
English Literature	29.0	30.3
Language	4.8	2.1

year the proportion of elections in social science and literature remained stable, while that for arts declined slightly and for science increased from 7 to 11 percent.

Dr. Dick then asked the question, "Under what faculty does the largest percent of X courses fall?"

TABLE B

*Course Choices of Two-Year Students Following Up
Form A Choices*

	<i>1st year</i>	<i>2d year</i>
Social Science	19.3	14.9
Natural Science	4.7	7.5
Arts	36.0	35.8
English Literature	33.7	38.8
Language	5.8	3.0

This table must be supplemented by Table C which shows the converse: of all *new* interests stimulated after arrival at college what faculty gets the greatest proportion?

TABLE C

New Course Choices of Two-Year Students

	<i>1st year</i>	<i>2d year</i>
Social Science	45.6	42.3
Natural Science	10.2	14.1
Arts	18.6	19.2
English Literature	22.0	23.1
Language	3.4	1.3

It is obvious that students bring their art and literature interests to college, and that social science interests are heavily stimulated after they arrive. It is however interesting that, after they arrive at college, roughly 20 percent each of new interests stimulated are in the fields of arts and literature. The college not only responds to, but also stimulates, student demands for work in these fields. In view of this success in arousing new interests it would seem fair to ask whether it would not be possible to do a better job of stimulating interest in science than is represented by the 10 percent increase. However, the poor showing of students tested for

achievement and abilities in this field militated against success. The recent (1941-42) addition of new work in physiology has helped to improve this situation.¹

Another way of looking at the problem is to summarize the proportion of new interests (Y) with the proportion of interests expressed on Form A (X) in each field. Here the proportion of X and Y courses appear as reciprocal:

TABLE D

	<i>Class A</i>			
	<i>1st year</i>		<i>2d year</i>	
	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>
Social Science	45	55	27	73
Natural Science	56	44	45	55
Arts	75	25	67	33
English Literature	70	30	60	40
Language	65	35	60	40

	<i>Class B</i>	
	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>
Social Science	47	53
Natural Science	60	40
Arts	80	20
English Literature	65	35
Language	72	28

We see that three times as many girls take art in pursuance of an earlier expressed interest compared to those whose interest is stimulated after they arrive. By contrast, of the science students only 25 percent to 50 percent more are pursuing originally expressed interests than the number of these whose interest was stimulated after they arrived at college. From this point of view the record for stimulating interest in science is not as poor as it seems, although it still suffers by comparison with the much greater proportion of students drawn to social science after entering college.

Dr. Dick has analyzed the extent to which interests stated

¹ It should also be noted that over a hundred students each year make use of the opportunity to get biological information through units associated with psychology courses and through the "marriage unit."

on Form A were or were not carried through in freshman courses. In the following table the X column represents interests actually taken up at college while the Z column (the reciprocal) represents those that were not.

TABLE E

	<i>Class A</i>	
	X	Z
Social Science	29.8	70.2
Natural Science	33.3	66.3
Arts	56.4	43.6
English Literature	64.4	35.6
Language	19.2	80.8
	<i>Class B</i>	
	X	Z
Social Science	46.9	53.1
Natural Science	60.9	39.1
Arts	51.5	48.5
English Literature	60.0	40.0
Language	45.8	54.2

In both classes (A and B) English and art interests are clearly more likely to be carried through than not, while social science interests are more unstable, that is less likely to be carried through than not. In the other fields the results are variable.

Looking at the data in a different way we find that in the first year:

More social science students acquire their interest after reaching college.

More students in every other field brought their interest in that field with them when they came to college.

In the second year, both social science and natural science include a larger proportion of students whose interest developed after reaching college, while in the other three groups nearly two thirds of the students in each group stated interest in this field in the Admissions Form A. This tendency increased in a third class where the analysis was carried through.

It is probably fair to say that girls are most likely to come to this college for literature and the arts, that being "awakened" to new possibilities is most apt to mean being awakened to problems that lead into social science. This is to be expected from everything that we know about these students, who had very high test ratings in literature and fine arts and came from backgrounds which protected them from social problems.

Student Reports on the Development of Interests

Let us see now what statistics and generalizations of this sort mean in terms of the students.

Out of thirty students interviewed at the end of their fourth year only half a dozen mentioned that their freshman-year approach had been undirected by definite preferences: they had wanted "a general education," or "background," or "something practical," or they just "didn't know." All of the others remembered that they had "wanted" painting, languages, child psychology, biology, dramatics. A few students recalled special desires: "I wanted history of art but there wasn't any"; "I wanted to paint, not just talk about painting"; "I wanted economics as background for law." Going back to the admissions records we find most of these wishes clearly stated in advance.

If we rely on this evidence of "chief interest," only about a quarter of the students who graduated made definite changes in the emphasis of their work between freshman and senior year. For the most part, artists, musicians, child psychologists, students interested in literature stayed in their fields. The many changes made in other choices (that is, choices for second and third courses each year) were extremely important, however, from the point of view of total development.

The experience of this group indicates that while the "chief interest" is likely to remain stable and develop at college, almost half of the courses taken by freshmen will be

courses in which an interest has emerged after reaching college. The choice of this half, then, may be laid to suggestions from advisers and teachers, conversations with friends, round tables, and many other planned and fortuitous sources of stimulation at college.

This is not the only point of influence of the college apparently; from 40 percent to 54 percent of the interests expressed in Form A are *not* followed through. These are the courses "I thought I'd like to try," but are not tried when something else turns up or is urged upon one, or when the student is uncertain about getting along with the teacher or some other course is "more important right now." If we generalize, then, about how the programs are made up, we can say that roughly half of the courses decided upon were definite interests of the students before college entrance; the other half may be credited to a combination of negative and positive influences at college.

It is also of interest to see the range of ways in which the "awakening" of new interests comes, as the students look back upon their freshman year. For M.J. it comes through her exploratory course, for J.H. through her don, for B.D. through hearing other girls talk about their courses. It is important to remember that quite opposite assertions are made on this last point; one student remarks on how much she learned about other courses from her friends, while another student reports that her friends rarely discussed their courses at all. In this connection several students admit a wish that they had visited a greater variety of classes to get an idea of what unfamiliar courses were like.

Students' own comments on the basis of their interests illustrate the range of meanings that "interest in a course" may have; ways of working, opportunity for recognition, exposure to new experience, security in objectivity:

I wanted to take biology to see what goes on inside. The main thing I got out of that year was a confirmation of my really serious interest in biology.

In biology the other girls had more manual skill than I in dissections and drawings and also probably worked harder than I, and by the middle of the term they were all ahead of me in their notebooks anyway. I was very discouraged about this. Instead of going on to the unit on Heredity with Mrs. T. I went on with conference work with Miss F. and spent about five weeks on a cat's gall bladder. *The dissection and drawing of the gall bladder was the one thing I felt in my whole freshman year as something accomplished, something you can draw a line under and say "Here is something that is a completed piece of work."*

I think working in the laboratory was very helpful. You have *responsibilities put right on you* and things have to be ready and they have to be right. That was a maturing experience. I think it is interesting in connection with other courses, as there are courses where you don't have responsibilities as it were, something you do for teacher. It is a social matter really—*you hold up the class if you don't do things right.*

Re Science: "I was curious. The kinds of things they were doing baffled me. [After getting into it] in physics I like the lab work and to actually see how things function."

I think as far as the sculpture part goes, I like to do things with my hands. I like trying all that kind of thing.

I remember going to a women's prison and to a training school. I remember how horrible the prison was and how wonderful the school was. The prison was so cold and unsympathetic, just as I had always thought of reformatories. I shudder when I think about it. I remember a couple of things we went to in New York. Realistic viewpoint of *what actually exists* instead of reading about them. I really saw them and saw the people. It made the whole thing so much more real. I remember sitting in the court for four hours and having it seem a half hour.

I was disappointed in exploratory art because "I wanted more action and less words and we got it the other way around." I wanted to go ahead and paint and not sit and talk painting and technique for six hours.

I took the Thomas Mann course. It was fascinating but *not much practical use*. The course was very interesting and I got good ideas out of it but I don't think it will be of any use to me later.

I wasn't ready for psychology then. . . . I finally dropped it and changed to economics after a month. I took psychology then in

my third and fourth years. I think so many other things you come in contact with through your other reading prepared you for that.

The fact that students could articulate some of the bases for their interests at the end of college (when the interviews from which these excerpts come were held) does not mean that at the beginning of freshman year these same students could have clearly stated that they wanted:

responsibility;
to do things with their hands;
to get a "realistic view of what actually exists";
to actually see how things function;
facts;
"more action and less words."

As freshmen they are more apt to be somewhat inarticulate, aware only of an attraction toward materials, or teachers, or methods of work. Part of the result of the freshman year or of college as a whole has been to help them become conscious of what they are working for, what lies behind their "interests."

Needs That Shape Interests

In this discussion of interests as seen by the students themselves at the end of the college course, we have found them referring to needs or values or motivating drives which appeared to interfere with or stimulate development or pursuit of their interests. Illustrations were given earlier of a need for status, a need which interfered with the development of an artistic interest because it did not carry sufficient status in its profession, and of a need for a home which had to be satisfied before literary talent could be developed. The scientific study of needs such as these has been brought into focus by the work of H. A. Murray and his collaborators at Harvard; we can agree that any personality may show needs for some of the following: a sense of achievement; independence, freedom; someone to accept as leader, guide; rapport,

warmth; appreciation, recognition; superiority, dominance, power; safety, protection, security, support; patterns, order. Needs at this level are doubtless the outcome of original temperament molded by varying experiences of frustration, competition with a brother or sister, domination or idolization by a parent and the like.

This discussion of needs may become more concrete if we consider what happens when a teacher gives criticism to each of four students. The first student may use the criticisms and make specific changes where indicated, as expeditiously as possible. The second student may start from scratch, rewrite the job, making use of criticisms where she understands them and they seem to be relevant. A third student may start from scratch, rewrite the whole thing, and make the same mistakes all over again. A fourth student may become discouraged and confused by the criticisms and give up, in spite of a strong initial interest in the area of study. Obviously the "need for criticism" must be interpreted in different terms for these four students, and most teachers would adapt the amount and terms of the criticism to the ways students use it.

Given plenty of time for a project in a chosen area, some students will use it productively, developing fresh areas in an original way and working more thoroughly than if time is short; others will keep plugging along in an unproductive, conscientious way with endless corrections, many of them meaningless; still others, given an assignment for a date three weeks ahead, will wait until the night before it is due to get to work.

Needs are not to be seen in these terms alone, but in terms of the limits or range of possible responses to the conflicts inherent in the process of getting educated today. The needs of Giovanni, tragically torn by his educational conflict between the forward-looking objectivity of Leonardo and the religious conviction of his priest, were not unlike those of a young Greek in the days of syncretism following the fall of the city-state, or the conflict of Tan Shih Hua in post-revolutionary China. To live in a world that is being remade

calls for flexibility from every young person; to share in the remaking makes creative demands which not every young person can meet. In any period of change there are, among others, the classicists who must return to old stabilities; the realists who look to the present (some students find everything unreal that is not a part of their firsthand experience); the romanticists who grasp reality with their feelings (some students find meaning only in that to which they can vibrate sympathetically). These varying capacities to face and cope with the uncertainties intrinsic in the stuff of contemporary college education create "needs" as real as those rooted in personal capacities and temperament that would be present regardless of the educational climate.

Thus, during the years of watching freshmen, we have come to think of interests less simply than might have been inferred from the questions in the earliest application forms as to what the student enjoys doing. We have found that interests, whether vocational or avocational, grow from a heterogeneous soil. What you *can* do well, what you enjoy doing, what you have energy to keep on doing, are all matters separate from each other, yet intimately related. They are important in the development of interests but no more so than questions of what you approve of doing, what you think needs to be done—what satisfies your conscience, in other words. And your conscience is different from your ego or ambition, which asks what is worth while, what will win me a place in the group of people by whom I wish to be accepted; or your self-pattern: what completes the picture of the kind of person I want to be? All of these questions are different from questions like: Your parents' ambitions for you, your teachers' notions of what you can do or need to do, the money value of different vocations in the locality where you will work, or the social acceptance value of your interests in your locality, if money value is not relevant.

One or another of these points is usually uppermost in the consciousness of the student. In one instance her awareness of her own character and needs may be expressed something

like this: "I want to be a scientist, I like scientists, their approach to life, their matter-of-fact view of things, the solid reality of their work, their objectivity," and this approach may motivate a persistent energetic effort to win a place among them. For another person, a talent, a fine voice, or a skill with form and line in painting may focus or direct a drive for achievement. For still another a sense of relation to the present world and its activities may be involved: "We are living at a time when economic and political change are remaking the human world. I want to understand it, to participate in it, so I will be an economist." This identification cannot be carried through unless minimal abilities for statistics, theoretical analysis, concrete observation, or any other necessary skill can sustain the pattern. But the abilities did not bring the focus of interest; the desire to identify actively with certain aspects of contemporary life did that. In all these instances, interests are the expression of the character and basic needs of the student.

Interests are sometimes spoken of lightly as if they could be taken off and put on, like spectacles. Yet any teacher who has followed the complex process of trial and error, of testing, and of getting satisfaction that leads on, as against getting enough satisfaction to stop, knows that interests which persist are seldom picked off bushes or taken out of a cupboard drawer. As the character is being formed, every basic process of growth of the personality from infancy on contributes toward the elimination of some interests as impossible and the nourishing of others which may be possible. The little girl of seven or eight who is still enjoying dolls, with happy fantasies in which they are virtually real babies to her, is more likely as an adult to enjoy motherhood as a genuine interest and to become interested in children, child psychology, nursing, and related activities.² The little girl who feels remote from people and dolls and finds satisfaction in

² D. M. Levy, "Psychosomatic Studies of Some Aspects of Maternal Behavior," *Psychosomatic Medicine*, IV, No. 2 (April, 1942).

fantasies of violent experience in jungle exploring is less likely at twenty to slip easily into experiences of marriage, childbirth, and bringing up children. The child whose health, lack of skill, or shyness prevents participation in vigorous physical activities but encourages development of quiet sorts of busy work that give practice to eye-hand coördination—woodwork, painting, sewing, puzzles or making cookies—will probably not be so likely to be a gym teacher at the age of twenty as a child whose week-in week-out experience lays the foundation for sports.

At another level the child whose values have developed through satisfaction in being “a lovely child” will ordinarily have a different group of vocational or interest alternatives from the child whose self-patterns have been colored by the value of being “an energetic worker.” Charlotte’s insecure status in a large family of cousins spurred her to intense effort to rival their literary achievements; she was driven by early experiences and abilities different from those of Marian, whose comfortable delight in an equally large and distinguished literary family was tempered only by the uncertainty whether she could really be a “good hostess, good wife and good mother”—that seemed so much to achieve.

A student may find a certain field of work satisfying because of the intrinsic methods of the field; dissecting may be interesting to one for the same reason that embroidery is to another—the process itself meets needs important to the individual. Or the emotional values intrinsic to the process or method may be decisive: Observing chemical reactions or making a telegraph set will give one student a sense of reality, solidity, security. She feels as if she were “touching bottom” when she really sees something happen. Other students find the changes of chemical events or the workings of electricity mysterious and provocative, and not particularly reassuring. Some of these may find the nuances of observation of behavior in psychology more congenial, familiar, “closer to reality.” Even abstract values discussed in philosophy carry

for some students this sense of touching bottom, getting down to fundamentals, while other students find such discussion elusive, vague, unsatisfying.

For still other students the content of the field may be of such basic importance as to counterbalance the influence of uncongenial methods. Even if your fingers are all thumbs, and anaesthetized animals are unpleasant, it may be so important to see how blood circulates, how an embryo grows, what death is, that you put up with the unpleasant methods of the biologists for the sake of the questions you can answer.

In still other instances the prestige value of a field may take precedence over content or ways of working. If you have already looked forward to college as the place to "acquire culture" you may struggle through a deal of literature or history on the strength of the reputation of Shakespeare, Thomas Mann, or Bismarck. Sometimes there is a conflict between such intellectual prestige needs as these and activity needs equally strong; you may wake up to the fact that it isn't really "Culture" that you want, it's a chance to take a radio apart.

Expressive Functions of Curricular Areas

We have already noted that one approach to the complex experience of pursuing an interest becomes clear when we ask what goes into this activity as compared with that. For instance what is involved in work with clay in contrast to work with stone within the field of sculpture? What goes into dissection of a cat or skillful drawing of the cat's thyroid gland? What is involved in writing book reviews or in teaching dramatics to a group of seven-year-olds?

Let us begin with sculpture. All sculpture involves expression of an artistic intuition of meaning in concrete objective form and the use of a three-dimensional medium. In addition to the initial concepts, there must be the capacity to work with one's hands and to visualize the resulting product. Other factors may enter into specific types of sculp-

ture: cutting down, as in work with wood or stone, and building up, as with clay. Still other processes are involved in related activities: pounding, hammering, as in metal work, etching. Perhaps we have enumerated enough activities to suggest that varied experiences of vigorous, crude, or delicately controlled movement are involved in this type of work, and it will not seem farfetched to suggest that basic personality values of aggressive vigor or delicate control *may* determine whether one is "interested" in an activity requiring these attitudes.

We may sharpen the distinction still further if we turn to painting. To achieve his forms a painter works with color, texture, line, area. To a Japanese artist sharp clear line may be of enormous importance, while to El Greco or Manet it may be of lesser moment. We have suggested that if you watch children who are really free in the sense of being permitted to do what they like, some will work with large areas of color, others will be chiefly concerned with line and detail—at the age of six.

The question whether one is "interested in" painting as taught by Mr. A or Mr. Z may hinge on whether there is an opportunity for the spacious manipulation of color or the refined use of line. These preferences probably tie in with other differences in the preference for sweeping, large-muscle activities, covering a large area as compared with fine-muscle coordinations which underlie the use of detail.

Other differences in the approach of different painters may affect the success of students who work with them. A primitive level of organization of color and form may appeal to one; another may emphasize the artistic creativity involved in selection of subject matter, stressing a focal concept and the projection of that concept through the medium of paint, which in itself is subsidiary. For one painter symbolic projection is significant, while for another art is confused by symbolism and is most pure when it deals with things as they are. Without doubt, art teachers share with students tempera-

mental preferences for different levels of organization of sensory material and dramatic or representational content which underlie different philosophies or dogmatisms about art.

In biological sciences we find other differences: putting together as against taking apart has value for one student; dissection is in itself satisfying to some, repulsive to others; observing behavior of white rats is less interesting than the processes of nurture and care; the reproduction with pen and paint of delicate nuances of a tissue is exciting to one student, tedious to another.

Underlying the complex values of a specific job involving both materials and methods are satisfactions in skill and in the use of muscles and mind to this end or that. These satisfactions determine "interests." Understanding them does not mean that we limit a student to activities in which she finds emotional satisfaction because of process-satisfactions or skill-satisfactions. But it does mean that we pay attention to these sources of interest and that we do not expect a student to develop sustained enthusiasm for a medium distasteful to her work-personality as seen in these terms.

In considering the question whether a student would be "interested" in a given field of work, we may well look not only at the operations involved in a given subject-matter field but at the operations carried on by individual teachers. Up to this point we have discussed interests in direct terms, as they grow from pleasure in skill, problem-solving or reaching a desired goal. Not uncommonly interests also serve more or less conscious negative, defensive, and compensatory values. An interest in language which you can tolerate may serve to protect you from pressure to study economics which you hate or think you hate; an interest in writing may grow precisely from a belligerent attitude toward your own limitations in writing and from overcompensatory efforts to get beyond these limitations.

To a certain extent the teacher cannot be separated from his materials and ways of working. An observer, a speculative thinker, a craftsman, all make their materials and methods an expression of themselves. One teacher makes an economics course out of an introduction to literature while another makes a literature course out of an exploratory course in psychology. This is the most obvious example. Equally pertinent are the differences between one teacher who makes a psychology course into a mathematics course, while another turns psychology into philosophy, and still another into poetry or religion. The values of each teacher are his subject matter. So are his ways of working: analyzing, creating, organizing, sketching in nuances of experience, communicating a sense of form. The student can never test out teacher, methods, materials separately but only the specific integration intrinsic in each course-taught-by-a-specific teacher. Within limits each teacher has a range of materials and methods at his disposal; he cannot really judge how a student handles analytic, creative, critical assignments, but only analytic, creative, critical assignments with this material, for this class, with me as teacher. The question of interest then can never be seen merely in terms of a traditional academic area of work such as art or science; it has to be seen in terms of the specific processes, experiences, and approach of a given teacher working on a phase of the area.

Interest Areas in Relation to Personality Patterns

More or less explicitly, Sarah Lawrence, like other liberal arts colleges, assumes a certain intrinsic validity in a pattern which includes both breadth and specialization of interest. The typical A.B. program of the students in this study includes some courses in at least three out of four areas, with five to seven courses (equivalent to 25 to 35 points) in one area of special interest. Certain students, however, for reasons that seemed urgent at the time had programs which to the

faculty appeared too "narrow" (8 to 13 courses in one field during four years) or too "scattered" (courses in too many unrelated areas).

How did the programs, narrow or scattered, actually function for the student? What explanations were given for the lack of balance, either by themselves or their instructors? What was the final appraisal at the end of the college experience?

The following reasons are given either by teachers or the student herself in cases of overspecialization:

Fear of trying out new material;

Fear of specific kinds of work:

- a) scientific, technical work of any kind;
- b) "cutting up" animals;
- c) "theory";
- d) "going into" one's own problems;
- e) "writing";
- f) "upsetting ideas" in economics.

In general, having "had enough" of other fields in preparatory school.

Dislike of subjects "ruined by prep-school teaching."

Wanting to "stick to the things I'm good in."

Wanting to "get as much as possible" in the field of strong interest.

In some cases these defensive reactions occur *after* freshman exposure to a wide range of materials and new methods of work, and in the case of a few students appear to be an obvious reaction to having "got in too deep and too fast." Certain students retreated to chemistry, as their instructor noted, because it was "something definite and factual, that they can feel sure of, or 'hold onto.'" In other instances the defensive reactions occur partly in response to other students' conversations about new courses that "break down your old ideas."

Sometimes they are an expression of more deep-rooted fears. One girl was traumatized by a series of family tragedies and unable to face any adult problems of human relations: psychology, sociology, even literature were all potential dyna-

mite to her; education was literally possible only in terms of safe areas of science and art where on the one hand she could deal with facts unshrouded in anxiety and on the other could give expression to her strong feelings and sensitive response to an objective world unentangled with her personal tragedies. A similar mechanism—the need to avoid facing conflicts too acute to be handled at the point where the girl found herself—early accounted for the avoidance of all social science and of psychological literary materials by other girls.

Conversely, intense specialization can arise from strong positive needs:

The new and exciting discovery of writing as an avenue of expression and learning led to a concentrated focus on journalism, creative writing, poetry and allied courses.

A compulsive drive to write arising from a strong family identification with literary members of the family and coupled with frustrations in social relations led one student to concentrate on writing though her ability was not brilliant.

A strong need for extroverted activity and leadership with people led another to specialize in psychology.

A rather special talent for observation and artistic recording of observation led a third student to specialize in biology.

Sometimes the positive need is merely an urge to “concentrate on something I can do well.”

We may summarize then by suggesting that specialized program-choices are likely to grow out of the student’s conscious or unconscious pressure to satisfy the needs most important to her. In different cases one of the following:

- security;
- prestige;
- vocational direction;
- avoidance of threats from conflicts, upsetting ideas, unclear solutions to problems;
- urge to sensuous, aesthetic, social, organizing experience;
- urge to produce concrete results;
- need for vigorous activity (sculpture, dance);
- need to avoid activity with objects, self or people.

Scattered programs with no focus over a four-year period may result from:

- a desire to "get all I can while I have the chance";
- a fear of "going into any field too deeply";
- indecision about a field to specialize in because of real interest in several.

But the scattering may, as in the case of Abigail, be only on the surface; a student may follow an important intellectual problem from one field to another to get as much understanding as possible from different angles.

Whenever extremely narrow or extremely scattered programs serve a primarily defensive function for a student, the question may rightly be raised whether the freedom to make such programs ostensibly in terms of the girl's interests really helps the student. Does it not reinforce the weakness that gives rise to the extreme type of program? This question is especially pertinent when a student clings, for example, to nonhuman, objective materials and runs away from every approach to human and social problems either through literature or social sciences. One girl who did this regretted it even before she left the college doors, realizing that she had lost the chance to get an understanding of the problems she had been escaping.

Another pertinent instance is that of the student who avoids all courses calling for creative expression, whether music, art, dance, or dramatics, "because I have no talent," then lives to regret what she has done "because I should like to understand and appreciate these subjects more." This avoidance is even more extreme at Sarah Lawrence in respect to the natural sciences, with the good reason that the student group as a whole is poorly equipped in ability or training to handle scientific materials. The personality implications of this are not clear, although it may be well to reflect on David Levy's report on his studies of overprotected children (overprotected not in economic terms, but in terms of maternal handling); Levy notes among them the tendency to choose

verbal and literary areas in schoolwork in preference to scientific ones.

The social implications are more obvious. Ours is an era when much masculine activity is focused on technological problems that can hardly be understood at all without scientific training. If we contrast this situation with that of pioneer days, when a husband and wife worked jointly on more or less common problems, we may well ask what may be the consequences of centering education for women largely on social, literary, and artistic problems and neglecting the scientific understandings that might give a common basis for discussion and planning with men. If men's education, conversely, becomes more and more specialized in vocational training and gives less time to problems of citizenship, family life, and the broad aspects of human relations between national or economic groups, the gap is accentuated. Perhaps fortunately, the war has stimulated some counterreaction. There is an increasing interest in the technical problems and a demand for women to fill many types of war jobs; this should in some cases contribute to a common basis of understanding.

These comments on the feminizing of education to the neglect of science cannot be allowed to pass without a further comment that the still relatively universal tasks of child-bearing and child-rearing—including the actual care and guidance of children, which falls chiefly to the mother—also call for their own educational preparation. The Merrill-Palmer study of college women after graduation³ stresses especially the failure of college to prepare women for these and other family responsibilities. It seems obvious, however, that a curriculum too heavily weighted with practical problems of immediate human relations would skimp the larger problems of citizenship and vocation as well as the scientific education already too seriously limited.

It will require a careful study of alumnae to show how many

³ R. G. Foster and P. P. Wilson, *Women after College* (New York, 1942).

Sarah Lawrence graduates feel that their education has prepared them for the human problems presenting such difficulties for the group in the Merrill-Palmer study, or for the many dramatic social and political changes occurring since their graduation, or for being the mature individuals of insight and understanding that the college hopes it has helped them to become. A possible fruitful point of departure for such a study would be provided by inquiring into the post-college experience of girls of different interests at college, including

Those who specialized in science;
Those who specialized in creative arts;
Those who specialized in social sciences;
Those who had a broad inclusive program.

Instability of Interests

While a student's "interest" in a major field of activity has high degree of stability, as indicated not only by choices at Sarah Lawrence but by the study of persistence of interests of women college students studied by Burgemeister,⁴ within and beyond this area of stability there are many uncertainties. Obviously there are many students who do not have sufficient interest to carry them through to a matured fourth-year competence in a field; many of them are not "interested" in the instructor's conception of how to develop increasing skill. The bases of their fragile or transient attraction to an area include the following:

Interests dictated by convention, parental authority, duty, etc. . . .

Interests based on ephemeral emotional responses: to "exciting" books, field trips, plays, music, etc., which some students neither understand nor wish to try to understand.

Temporary "associative" interests based on a current boy-friend's activity, immediate family problems and the like.

These differ from mature interests in that they are not strongly enough rooted to survive faculty pressure toward

⁴B. B. Burgemeister, "The Permanence of Interests of Women College Students," *Arch. Psychol.*, No. 255 (1940).

thorough understanding and analysis; on occasion, however, they may develop into mature interests. Whatever the source of the interest, the faculty are willing to take it seriously only when the student is willing to master the problems involved in understanding the subject matter of the field or in mastering the appropriate techniques. There are a few exceptions to this principle as to most general rules: an "interest" may fill an important need at a certain stage of development even when it does not lead to ripe competence in its own area. Helen's interest in intelligence tests proved to arise from her need to be sure that they were not infallible and did not give a complete account of a person's potentialities; once she had reassured herself on this point, she could, in spite of her own discouragingly mediocre scores, regard herself as an intelligent person who had a right to move ahead at her own pace on the problems that were important to her, and she completed an A.B. degree with satisfaction to her faculty if not with brilliance. Many girls take up the study of family problems just long enough to discover that it is generally agreed that adolescents need to wean themselves from excessive dependence upon their parents. Similarly, a legitimate though apparently short-lived interest in painting or music may serve to equip a student to understand concerts and current discussion of art, which is what she happens to need. Such interests can be demonstrably genuine though short-lived.

Compulsive interests which serve a function of giving security or prestige to the student may be in this latter group; these would include, in some colleges, interest in certain scientific methods of work which carry prestige; at Sarah Lawrence, certain instances of "creative" writing interest appear to fall in this category.

Implications for Guidance

The final meaning of these observations may be summarized briefly as follows: many students have well-established interests which can be counted upon to shape the core of their work in college. These interests may have any combination

of a variety of sources, innumerable illustrations of which have been mentioned. A few may be repeated here: satisfaction in unusual ability; identification with an admired relative, friend, or person of achievement; an expectation of prestige or security through pursuit of the interest; a defense against feelings of insecurity in other areas of life; pleasure in the processes of work involved in the field; curiosity regarding the questions to be answered; need to solve a personal problem through insight available in the field. These emotional needs and areas of satisfaction in work-processes are as important to understand as are the abilities of a student when we come to evaluate her interests.

The interests of some other students are not well established: of these, some are stimulated in college; others may have existed in a vague form before college but they remain diffuse or scattered, without concentration upon a definite focus. Some students on the other hand cling excessively to one area of interest, either defensively or to avoid worrisome work. Students are by no means generally grateful for guidance which has allowed their fears to prevent them from exploring areas potentially useful or important to them.

In the light of these conclusions, guidance officers will do well to evaluate a student's expressed interests in terms such as these: What does this area of interest mean to her? Where has the interest come from? How is it fortified by the pattern of her values, picture of herself, her characteristic areas of satisfaction? Will she enjoy doing the kind of work involved in this area at a mature level? What are the vulnerable aspects of this interest-pattern that may result in wasted time if the interest is not sustained?

If the student's interests appear to be overconcentrated, what other data on her pattern of life indicate whether this is a wholesome specialization or a timid clinging to a safe area, or an avoidance of dangerous areas?

If a student is indiscriminating and responds to every stimulus, is there any evidence to show whether this is due

to immature diffuseness or to a fear of getting too deeply into one area?

The answers to questions of this sort will never be completely clear after one brief interview in the freshman year, although indications of such trends as prestige-needs, defensiveness, or deep roots of a given interest can appear in such a conference. The answers will have to be revised after teachers have watched the student at work in different areas and after the student's own explorations have taught her how real her supposed interest actually is, how far it will sustain her through the rigors of college work, and how much it contributes toward her own sense of growing up.

VARIETIES OF LEARNING ATTITUDES

DURING RECENT DECADES abundant evidence has accumulated in laboratory and classroom that learning springs largely from the urge, the need to learn. Many discussions of the value of finding real interests are motivated by the desire of teachers to see more genuine learning. The issue is complicated, however, by the fact that the relation of interest to the ability to learn is a two-way relation. Often it is through the first steps of learning that interest is awakened. The skill of the teacher does not lie solely in finding interests that appear ready-made in the first month. The skilled teacher also offers directions in which the student's mind may awaken to interests which spring from and grow with the confronting of a field which at the beginning was blank and meaningless; this sign of spontaneous and eager exploration of the area of aroused interests often signalizes the beginning of real learning. Awareness of this fact underlay the plan for exploratory courses at Sarah Lawrence; such courses would give teachers the opportunity to observe the responses of different students to different materials in a learning situation and to present more varied materials for this purpose.

It became apparent of course that the purely intellectual or aesthetic interests in a subject are by no means the only or even the dominant motivation when a student confronts new subject matter. One teacher suggested that "much of the quick acceptance of new patterns on the part of some students is dictated by their own need for security," while another suggested that "integrated development may be more likely to appear at points that do not arouse too much conflict in the student." Integrated learning as compared with a superficial eagerness that did not last occupied the center of attention for some teachers. Integrated learning involved changes in attitude. It was seen clearly that such change involved "a continual interplay of background, personality and

present experience." It was impossible to say, however, that girls of a certain kind of background were incapable of growth in attitudes. Different girls responded differently to very similar backgrounds, and showed different degrees of freedom from or of dependence upon them.

The background is not separate in the sense of a preparation finished and done; it is an active, present, potential factor and is being modified by the college experience itself as this re-interprets the environmental picture. So, too, is the college experience being dictated by the background. Finally the current status of relationship to family, boy friends, acquaintances connect with the motivation underlying interests and to some extent determine these; at the same time these relationships form evidence, along with book learning, for tentative conclusions and the new questions.

It became increasingly clear that interests and attitudes were intimately related in their contribution to genuine as opposed to lip-service learning. Interests as reported by the student or as manifesting themselves in the course of the work were not merely simple responses to the objective value inherent in the structure of a given subject matter, but were also a reflection of a web of temporary or enduring trends, related in an intimate way to her personality, her family and her group, and to her picture of herself.

We may restate this by saying that college experience, when it includes integrated learning as conceived by the teachers, often involves a broadening or even a reshaping of values which have become part of a student as a result of previous living. It will not be surprising to find that where the original structure of values is too rigid, or in some instances where the new orientations prevalent at college are too remote from the frame of reference the student brings with her, "integrated learning" is impossible. Some of the values which will determine her learning experience are reflected in her attitudes toward coming to college.

Attitudes toward Coming to College

For nearly all freshmen, coming to college is one of the most dramatic new situations they will ever experience. Whether a student comes from the protections and restrictions of the usual boarding school or from home she generally confronts a new and unfamiliar world at college. Here there are no restrictions to the satisfaction of her curiosity; indeed she is expected to become acquainted with the experience, the problems, the thought of the adult world. This often means that she is now exposed for the first time to all the realities from which she has been protected because she was "too young to understand." She is also expected to take responsibility for the planning of her life and work and often feels that for the first time she is "being treated like a grown-up."

At the same time, coming to college is an experience as different for different students as the students themselves are different. For one student this event has endless strings. Some parents who trust neither the college nor the girl send her with a dozen admonitions: you must take French; don't take economics your freshman year; don't waste your time on sculpture; psychology is dangerous; math isn't a sensible thing for a girl to go on with in college. Other parents, trusting the good name of the institution, leave it up to the college. A surprisingly large number trust their daughter with either complete confidence or the feeling that "if she doesn't learn to make her own decisions now she never will," and leave it up to the girl.

At first, few of the important attitudes toward college work which the student brings along with her are fully clear to her or to her teachers. A variety of features of the first days, weeks, or months of college life may mask, distort, repress or exaggerate traits which can be seen at normal ordinary level only after the heat and smoke of first adjustments to college have disappeared. What distortions, what repres-

context of specific learning, they do not imply that from the first we know all that this involves about every student. We know chiefly what the student wants us to know—what she tells us unwittingly by her behavior as well as by her words. If she wants us not to know the things most important to her development in college we are usually apt not to know them, unless a crisis forces us to inquire more deeply. What we know—what the student wants us to know—goes far however to help in understanding what the total experience of being a freshman means for this girl's education. To be sure we have many objective facts about her home town, her father's work, her school and her position of leadership or passive participation in school activities.

Describing these differences does not tell us what the differences mean to the student. This we do not always know. We do know that to Cora, her family's wealth meant a great deal; she was used to champagne and orchids and couldn't tolerate the manners of a boy who didn't know what side of the street to walk on. We know that to Ida, her family's poverty meant a great deal. Her shyness and reserve in making friends lasted far beyond freshman year. We know that Rebecca's excellent work in preparatory school was in part a standard she had to keep when she got to college, but which seemed threatened by new college demands. And that Abigail's high-school experience had not prepared her for the sophisticated talk and behavior of the socially experienced and traveled girls who seemed to her predominant here.

We know, now, but did not know then that Clara's admiration for a distinguished older brother and her desire for a place in the limelight beside him were more important than the fact that she was 3,000 miles away from her Western ranch home for the first time, and that Marian was pathetically uncertain of whether she could keep up with her brilliant and distinguished relatives.

Being away from home—a distance of 2,000 miles—did not mean as much to Beatrice, whose sister and friends had

been here and who was welcomed by family friends in the East, as it did to Judith, who could get home in three hours but who found at college an unfamiliar setting and who had made no acquaintances at all. Coming with a background of social prestige meant something quite different for Madeleine, who was not quickly accepted by her classmates, from what it meant to Cora, who immediately found social distinction in the college group.

A background of preparatory-school leadership meant one thing to a girl bewildered by the students' lack of response to her ("at prep school I was tops"), and quite another thing to a girl who had been thoroughly fed up with school offices and was glad to be free of both the prestige and the responsibility they involved.

Attitudes toward learning were also influenced by the reasons for choosing this particular college. Half of those who completed the college course, in their senior year mentioned freedom and opportunity to follow the work they wanted as reasons for their original choice. "Freedom" had several different meanings: to one girl it represented an opportunity to concentrate on biology and art; to another it meant "aims and methods that I liked"; and to some students its meaning was negative—"no lectures, no exams." A small number of self-centered girls interpret freedom superficially as the opportunity to have their own way at every point; such students may be unteachable, in contrast to the majority who appreciate having an individually tailored program and are glad within its outlines to be "taught." Occasionally students put up a bluff of strong intellectual interest when applying for admission but forget it before they arrive; they come to college for miscellaneous reasons not helpful to "integrated learning."

Other attitudes toward learning are influenced by the different events, different kinds of fun, different ways of experiencing different worries that have gone into the preceding 16 or 18 or 20 years of growing up. We know that differ-

ent patterns of sensitivity, of assimilation, of resistance to life's threats or of resourcefulness in meeting them have been formed. They are expressed in the way in which the student digests her experiences and copes with her worries. We know that a psychological X ray might show us one mind stored with rich observations of various people: cook, grandmother, school principal, deckhands on the boat, the man at the news stand, the pastor of the church, the baby across the street. The student has thought and wondered about these people and may have puzzling questions about some of them. Another girl brings chiefly an absorbing, because frustrating, series of memories leading up to the recent divorce of her parents. The mind of another is full of nuances of perception accumulated from weeks in the woods, or the country, where concrete impressions of sights and sounds and smells of nature were the stuff of her experience. Another brings chiefly a set of habits and patterns of propriety accumulated from a boardingschool regime too rigid to leave any freedom of individual approach. Another brings a store of facts and information gathered over years of wide reading.

When we ask students to write autobiographies they reflect just such differences as these; to one student her life is a chronology of schools attended, while to another it is a kaleidoscope of feelings. These differences in ways of experiencing are just as important to what is learned and the terms in which learning comes to each student as the assumptions about the college or the reasons for coming here. In the study of history the girl who experiences life in terms of chronologies will be likely to find the chronological approach to history the desirable one and may want this sort of skeleton for all her learning, while the other will find meaning more easily, if not exclusively, in the experiences and feelings of individuals who made history; so with literature, social science, art and very likely the whole range of college courses.

Another type of information our psychological X ray might

give us is a picture of what the student's mind has come to mean to her—not in terms that she would use at the outset but in the terms by which we can describe her after a year or two. To Caroline, her mind has been trained to fit her into the demands of social life; to Patsy, using her mind may be a symbol of being grown up; for Rebecca her mind is a tool with which she can get at the root of things; Carol uses her mind to learn the right rules and patterns. Salvation from banality is one student's hope, while the intelligence of another serves chiefly the function of protection against shock. A somewhat similar purpose is served by the mental development of still another who covers up her fear of being too spontaneous by exhibiting an intellectual façade. For still other students, their minds may be tools to solve problems, to gain power and to master life, or similarly to bolster up a wavering ego. Shy or detached students may use their minds to gain access to people, as a tool for understanding and rapport. These functional differences in what each girl's mind has come to mean for her or do for her underlie further differences in what "learning," "education," "interests" mean for these same students.

But we have no X ray that permits this immediate glimpse of the mental furniture each student brings to college. We only learn about it gradually, sometimes indirectly through her behavior, her use of the resources college offers. Although the results might be more valuable than the best results of intelligence tests, we have no easy way of discovering quickly this picture of how the student takes hold of experience, what she puts into it, what individual qualities of insight, perceptiveness, imagination she brings to her thinking, what conflicts or anxieties block her purposes.

Attitudes toward Teaching and Being Taught

Apart from specific attitudes toward the material or methods of specific fields of work, general attitudes toward situations of being taught vary. One student felt all teaching as a

threat to her independence; another carried over resentments from teachers whom she had felt to be hostile to her; another automatically opposed all authority; another fretted if she was not told precisely what to do; another fitted in comfortably, accepting direction when it was given, going ahead under her own steam when it was not.

Some students felt an emotional need for accomplishment which stimulated them to use their capacities to the fullest extent; others, even some whose ability was outstanding, felt no urge to "do something with it." Either the satisfaction of this latter group lay in social relations, or the girls had never learned to "work" as much as even a brilliant student must work to turn competence into results. Others wanted occasional achievement but did not sustain consistent effort toward a stable level of achievement. One student was painstakingly thorough even when it wasn't necessary; another could be thorough when it was important; another was never thorough. Either the thorough or the never-thorough student may be creative, capable of fresh perceptions, original insights. One girl could collect data systematically and tabulate it accurately but could not plan original projects of her own based upon the data; one got lost in details so that she could find no hypotheses nor conclusions, while another overlooked details in far-flung generalizations that were never adequately founded. One student learned through being told what to do, another through identification with or resistance to the teacher, another by imitation, still another through her own trial and error. These differences in approach to learning are summarized from teachers' notes on their behavior; when we examine their own remarks in conferences with teachers, we find a comparable variety of goals and values affecting the kinds of work to which they respond or which they find helpful and important.

To some students learning means fact collecting; to others it means being entertained by interesting ideas. To some students, handling ideas is a matter of nut-cracking or puzzle-

solving; to others it is "illumination," "insight," "understanding." To some, learning means power, skill, craftsmanship, achievement. To others it is a means to "a job" or a degree. To others it means a role, that of being intellectual or "cultivated," or able to participate in the society of intelligent, cultured people. To others it means "getting closer to reality," "contact with things I haven't seen, or read, or been allowed to talk about before." To others it means getting an orientation, "finding oneself," getting a philosophy of life.

The remark, "I'm learning more than I've ever learned before," is likely to mean, "I feel that I'm touching bottom now, I'm really getting at basic questions; I'm getting beneath the surface. I'm getting past the taboos grownups have always set up before."

Different aspects of learning receive varying emphasis by different teachers, too. To some members of the faculty learning means especially a refinement of techniques of criticism, the achievement of form, or of discriminating logic. To others the emphasis is upon heightened sensitization to qualities of experience, freedom from bias, broader orientation, while still others emphasize the release of powers of expression, of creativity. Some concentrate upon stocking the mind with information, or upon acquisitions of skills in language, crafts, dialectic; and others focus upon "insight," "perspective," "understanding."

Undoubtedly the role or behavior of the teacher influences the students' attitude toward learning. The case of Fern ¹ and also that of Hortense ² illustrate certain ways in which this happens. Plato's midwife-teacher is unsatisfactory to students who wish to sit directly at the feet of a master or be trained like an apprentice.

These different assumptions of teachers and students regarding the processes and meanings of learning were quite as important for the student's adjustment and development as the selection of the material or subject matter. Students

¹ See p. 244.

² See p. 174.

who want to amass information or achieve dialectic skill may be disappointed in a teacher who is chiefly concerned with "insight." These patterns of learning are not entirely independent either of the interests and capacities we have discussed above or of more general aspects of the kind of person a given student is or wishes to be. Beyond these variations in the approaches of individual students and teachers to learning problems, we find certain general trends.

The reports of teachers of freshman courses are clear on the fact that, while many students want to "know the answers" to some of the urgent problems of social and personal adjustment and to understand scientific and artistic developments in contemporary life, the teachers were largely concerned with ways of thinking and learning. Instructors' criticisms were typically couched in terms like these: "pigeon-hole viewpoint"; limited imagination; lack of critical attitude; emotional attitudes prevent analysis; failure to see relationships; rigid prejudices; study is a mechanical process; material does not make a deep emotional impression; inability to observe; inability to put experience to work; inability to relate observations with reading; difficulties in concentration; gives stereotyped answers; antagonistic to new ideas; contented with facts; no ability to generalize; difficulty in writing; glib superficial acceptance of new ideas; unable to apply her understanding; disorganized approach to work; pseudo-intellectualism; sentimentality; dependence on rules.

Conversely, teachers were pleased with "increasing curiosity," critical ability, ability to "direct genuine interest toward solid work," independence, ability to defend own opinions, accurate observations, well-organized reports, patience and ingenuity, success in controlling technique, eagerness to find principles, initiative in creating theories, good insight, sensitivity, reflectiveness, disciplined thinking, a realistic empirical approach, sincerity, understanding, imagination. In the minds of most teachers the process of learning is directed toward achieving this kind of self-sustaining matu-

ity which includes thinking objectively, mastery of the skills needed in a field, insight, imagination and confidence in attacking serious problems.

Teacher-Student Rapport Contributes to Learning

Just as important as the attitude toward learning is the human quality of faculty response to students when the barrier of marks is removed and teaching is transferred from the lecturing level to the level of conference discussion. When a teacher's life consists of a succession of conversations⁴ with a student in the other chair in the office the personality of the student is of great importance. Teaching that consists of vital communication between two individuals requires that communication be possible. There must at least be some basis of getting together that involves spontaneous satisfaction for both. It will be apparent that different teachers meet special needs for different students. It is equally obvious that students meet varied needs of the teachers, as in the case of: paternal or maternal persons who derive satisfaction from their temporary relation as parent-substitutes to freshmen just crossing the bridge from dependence to self-reliance; social, warm, human teachers who enjoy the opportunity for sustained contact with a variety of personalities; protective teachers who, projecting upon students their own college frustrations, try to make them happy; detached people who enjoy as spectators the panorama of experience created by each new group of students; intellectuals who find it hard to admit that sixteen- and seventeen-year-old freshmen are not always completely grown up; and easy-going teachers who accept the students' adolescence with comfortable tolerance. All these things lie back of teaching satisfactions and dissatisfactions in any institution where a teacher has a chance to know students. But in our sentimental glorification of the teaching profession we do not always admit that teachers use students just as students use teachers.

Freshmen comments on faculty throw light from another

angle: Miss R. is "too young, she could see right through me." Mr. L. "doesn't seem to know where he's going, at least he doesn't tell us." "I liked Mr. J. because he was new so we were both in the same boat." "Mrs. R. is grand because she tells you exactly where you stand." "Mrs. H. is so wonderful; she makes you want to work twenty-four hours a day." In these concrete terms students reflected their needs for stimulus, reassurance, clear direction, for inviolacy, or for participation as different faculty meet or fail to meet them.

A more intensive analysis of what teachers and students mean to each other will also some day concern itself with differences in teaching attitude and function: Miss T. somehow turns her students into collaborators and sets up a kind of partnership of learning; Mr. J.'s ideas act rather like a rich fertilizer which improves the soil of thinking so that finer products grow from it; Mr. D. handles students like apprentices, giving a direct straightaway sort of *training* which develops skills that can be used as tools. These differences in students' and teachers' attitudes toward learning determine the placement of students with different teachers. Analogous differences as we have seen are characteristic of students: one girl is the kind who wants and takes "good training"; another craves acceptance as a collaborator; a third is the sort who needs a chance to "grow."

Implications for Guidance

If our observations of the varied meanings of interests to different students have pointed toward the need to evaluate each student's field of work in terms of its relation to her character structure and basic needs, these observations of students' attitudes toward learning, toward being taught, toward coming to college, point to the importance of selecting the right teacher and the right method of teaching as well as the right fields of work for a given student. Probably no one teacher and no one program is right for all students and certainly many teachers are wrong for some students. How-

ever, a concentrated diet of one kind of teaching method is probably wrong for most students, since students need both the kind of teachers who speak their language, and teachers who will expose them to new ways of learning through which they may expand. This does not mean that a haphazard or arbitrary combination of teachers and courses would fit most students' educational needs, any more than an arbitrary standard selection of clothes would fit their bodies, or an arbitrary collection of drugs fit their medical needs. The selection of teachers and the selection of courses can both be tailored to the students' present dimensions and expectation of growth.

STAGES IN ORIENTATION AND GROWTH

WE HAVE SAID that among the aspects of learning viewed as growth toward maturity are a broadening and reshaping of values and attitudes brought to college by the student. Sometimes, among flexible young students who have the requisite security in facing new experience and modesty toward their present level of development, this happens steadily without emotional upheaval, climaxes, or backtracking. With many others growth at the college level does not come so peaceably. The teachers' reports frequently comment on the confusion or shock experienced by many protected freshmen when expected to observe, discuss, analyze facts and events previously shut out from their experience.

Shock-Reactions as Part of the First Phase of Orientation

It is not hard, of course, to find discrepancies between the observations of faculty on students during their first year or two of college and the reports made by students themselves after the college course is nearly complete. Among such discrepancies one is the fact that faculty so often observe a shock-reaction of students to their early work in college, while this is seldom mentioned by seniors. Such experiences of shock may come in almost any area: in the field of art a student brought up in the "refined" and "pleasant" tradition is disturbed when exposed to new criteria; art as a way of dealing with forms or a medium for interpreting almost any aspect of real life is no longer merely pretty and may not even seem beautiful. Yet how can it be art if it is not beautiful? When beauty of this soothing sort has been a major comfort, the weaning process may be traumatic indeed.

In the field of economics, psychology, and other social sciences, "field trip shock" is a common experience. All her life

the student has been sheltered from knowledge of the "seamy" side of life; she is unprepared for what one sees getting into and out of subways on the way to the settlement houses, boys' clubs, housing projects, schools for special children, juvenile courts with which she is expected to become familiar. The biology laboratory may present shocks of a related sort to girls who dread the sight of blood, cut flesh, internal organs, or immature organisms. Psychology with its interminable case studies shares with exploratory courses in literature the opportunity for book-shocks when taboo topics are discussed.

In all these cases a certain framework of values and thought which has been integrated into the student's personality through a protective secondary-school education is jeopardized. Such jeopardy is also felt when a course in a philosophy or religion introduces new concepts at variance with "what I have always believed."

This shock experience may have different consequences for different students. One student ran away from psychology and biology in her freshman year only to return a year later fortified by a successful adjustment to other aspects of her college life. Another student ran away from literature to physics and never came back. Other students may get wind of the shocks in store for them in certain areas and resolutely keep away from these areas through two or four years of college education, snugly settled in safe areas which do not jolt their point of view.

Many, many other students by various sequences used their shock experience to get educated and succeeded. It is exactly this upsetting of previously crystallized assumptions that opens the way to a reconsideration of values and a fresh organization of the information and experience offered in college. The extent to which this is possible depends on a number of conditions: the student may transfer her identification and loyalty from her parents to the faculty; in this case the new orientation may be largely an adoption of the approach

and point of view of her substitute parents. Or she may find the experience of thinking stimulated by the disturbance of old intellectual securities so absorbing in itself that it provides its own emotional security until new facts have been assimilated.

The extent to which this occurs is governed by the pattern of security which the girl has built up. If, like one student, she identifies with the vested interests of her exclusive suburban family and her security lies in her share of their status at a superior economic level, it will not be as possible for her to consider points of view which threaten that base of her security as it is for another whose security lies in the warm mutual affection of a family of indifferent status and little concern about status-problems. Similarly a girl who has grown up in the "South" or the "East" and identified herself as a certain type of person accepted in the community from which she came and to which she expects to return, may find it impossible to take on or consider points of view incongruent with her picture of herself and her group. Undoubtedly a considerable number of the students who do not return after the first or second year are students who find their education unassimilable whether they call it "not being impressed" or "not getting what they wanted."

As we have noted, those who did stay and who continued through four years of college mention this shock-experience very seldom. The implication is twofold: the shock-experience either became so constructive for them that they forgot its original quality or they actually experienced little of it because they were more adequately prepared at secondary school or at home to meet contemporary conflicts in thought and life.

To point up the shock-experience as one aspect, for some students, of their freshman experience is simply to illustrate the more universal process of orientation to college. Whether a student experiences this initial shock or not, college is to some degree a new situation to which she must become

oriented. The degree of newness depends on many things. If she has come from progressive schools, college is likely to be merely a new place in which to continue familiar methods of work within a framework of values that is also familiar. There are for many students many points at which this continuity does not exist. The demand for a deepening insight made by her new teachers may not have much connection with her previous competence in passing examinations. When confronted with an opportunity to plan her own work she may feel that she is not being "taught." In addition, her social patterns may differ from those of her contemporaries—the groups, clubs, and organizations of the college may differ from those she is accustomed to.

All of these matters and many more contribute to make her first year a problem of orientation, a problem of relating herself to a complex situation which is more or less different from what she expected—sometimes, not always, happily different. This process of orientation takes place in different ways for different students, at the college level just as certainly as at the nursery-school level.

Certain students appear to be quite passive in their freshman year; they drink in all the aspects of the new experience and its implications for them. Others take hold of any point of security—a chance teacher who says a kind word, a course that looks possible—and with one foot on this small block of security look around. In any specific course such students may progress by first finding a point of clarity, then moving step by step into wider areas in a gradual process of growth in grace. Others may dive headlong into the midst of the new situation and material, sputtering and laughing as they come up, but exhilarated by their intellectual baptism by immersion. Still others find themselves less dramatically lost in an amorphous fog of newness which gradually leads to points of clarity. The character and extent of the problem of orientation and the degree of shock or long adjustment it requires depend, of course, partly on the gap between the values

of the home-and-school culture from which the girl came and the college values, and partly on individual characteristics of the girl. "Immature" is a favorite faculty term for students to whom many college attitudes seem strange.

Immaturity and Differing Rates of Growth

Naïve or immature students may be, and often are, shy, but some intrepid souls may also be naïve. Immaturity in this group appears in girls who come from high schools of standard classical emphasis, who have been exposed to little or no social science, contemporary art, or literature. When their secondary education has been directed by a rigid schedule with precise assignments, and they are exposed to little give and take of discussion about contemporary problems at home, their values may remain quite sentimental, popular, "low-brow" or "immature." In certain cases the growth pattern of the girl is more responsible than her cultural background; that is, the student is more immature than other students of similar background and has been less ready emotionally and intellectually for dealing with adult problems.

Every individual has her own rate and her own pattern of maturing. We know for instance that some girls menstruate at ten and others at seventeen or eighteen; and while thirteen is the average for a large proportion of girls the number whose sexual maturation falls below twelve and over fourteen is large enough to compel attention, since it is this group of deviates from average which is likely to include girls who are having difficulty in relating themselves to the social patterns determined by the average. Similarly, growth spurts in height take place with some girls at ten or eleven and these may reach their maximum height by twelve; others are still "little girls" at twelve or thirteen and do not enter the final growth spurt until fourteen or fifteen. In some cases parallel, in others independent, aspects of maturing vary just as widely. Some girls are "boy-struck" at twelve or begin to go

out at that age while others develop no strong heterosexual interest before seventeen or eighteen. Weaning from parents, and a sense of responsibility and independence in planning for oneself comes much earlier for some than for others.

Related to all these is the broader pattern of maturing of interests; broad enough to include the crystallization of a role, a "who and what am I and what shall I do or be?" For some girls this question has been answered before they come to college, to their own satisfaction, and that of everyone else. For others it is not answered until the sieve of years-out-of-college has eliminated some early possibilities and left others to grow if they can. Each of the aspects of maturation just mentioned may be somewhat independent of the others; no one of these is an adequate criterion of growth in itself. As Stolz¹ has shown, the pattern of relations of all aspects of growth is necessary as evidence regarding the growth level of an individual child.

Extreme degrees of differences in maturity as seen in colleges are reflected in faculty comments to the effect that "M.J.B. is an unusually mature (and 'poised,' or 'critical' freshman). She knows what she wants and her judgment seems so sound that there is no reason for it to be questioned." Or, "A.M. is one of the most naïve and immature freshman I have seen. She is easily confused by the adult ideas of many of the other students, finds it hard to come to a decision."

Actual physiological immaturity accompanied by emotional inexperience can be distinguished from immaturity due to overprotection without any physical basis, and from the apparent immaturity chiefly due to cultural differences customary among girls from small-town high-school backgrounds. In some instances two or all three of these factors are intimately interrelated. Natasha was an "immature" girl of 20 who had a marked retardation of glandular development.

¹ H. R. Stolz, and others, *The First Berkeley Growth Study* (Berkeley, Calif., 1938).

She had grown up in a very anxious overprotecting family and in a provincial community, so that little corrective stimulation was contributed by her surroundings.

Current research in the field of psychology offers further hypotheses and insights useful in the understanding of different patterns of intellectual development. Freeman² has clearly shown how different individual rates and patterns of mental growth may be, and he points out that present research substantiates the popular suspicion that precocity is by no means certain to involve ultimate superiority, since some children reach the end of physical (skeletal) and also mental development early while others continue to grow physically or mentally or in both respects into the late teens. These slowly maturing children, who may seem "immature" at graduation from high school when they are seventeen, may continue to mature through the next few years. Such a pattern of slow maturing may well underlie the difficulties of Beth B., who seemed very immature as a freshman and only a little less so in her second year, but who continued to grow at a steady pace throughout her junior and senior years, which, in consequence, showed more creditable work than she had produced at first.

Rhythms of Growth

As rates of growth differ, so do rhythms of growth. In the field of research in physical growth we are familiar with evidence for "growth spurts" and periods of latency when little change is apparent until the next "spurt" comes along. Somewhat analogous periods of latency followed by dramatic progress in achievement occurring in adult human beings and animals are clearly not due to growth but to a pattern of learning. Sequences of latency and blossoming in social and creative fields have been reported by us on the basis of records of preschool children where it is impossible to separate

² F. N. Freeman and C. D. Flory, *Growth in Intellectual Ability as Measured by Repeated Tests* (National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1937).

learning and growth. Records of college students show plenty of instances of similar alternations; the periods of latency are usually noted with anxiety by teachers who are likely to assume steady growth, development, or productivity as a valid norm. Jane was a clear example of a student whose approach to college her first year was apparently passive; it was characterized by little or no contribution to class-discussion and only limited hints to inner intellectual activity. Early in her sophomore year she got her bearings, became more decisive in her choices and changes in subject-matter fields, became active in extracurricular activities and produced outstanding work in her courses.

Such periods of latency followed by release and vigorous activity are apt to be interpreted as "marked development" when the latency is originally construed as a passive or ineffectual response at the beginning of freshman year, and the "development" is often credited to the college instead of being seen as part of the pattern of inner unfolding probably typical of the student in any new situation. Accurate longitudinal records would be of the greatest help to anticipate or recognize such patterns: the girl who, like little Joyce at the age of two to four, repeats a pattern of quiet drinking-in followed by rich creative expression is apt to repeat this pattern in many new situations. This sequence of drinking-in then giving out cannot however be expected in even a majority of students who are passive at the beginning, since patterns of passivity have many origins. Where intellectual values are rooted in strong parent-identifications of the sort Liss has described, the student may encounter a serious conflict when college exposes her to points of view at variance with those most valued by parents; such a conflict may result in passivity or withdrawal from work. Or, when at college students are deprived of the accustomed praise for an approach or for work-products, the frustration may be demoralizing and may be followed by withdrawal or failure to make any effort at all.

Initial or prolonged passivity may also be rooted in patterns of inhibition which act as a defense against anxiety or hostility. We shall see later that sources of initial insecurity at college are as varied as their expressions, and can be seen at the root of such patterns as rigid behavior; scattered, disorganized thinking; bluffing; overenergetic efforts at achievement, as well as passiveness. Anxiety about one's social status in the new situation, or about one's ability to cope with the strange demands for intellectual work at the college level, may be nearly paralyzing to some students. This quiet withdrawn behavior is often almost impossible to distinguish from the almost equally passive behavior of students like Maud and Maria, whose passivity is closer to the passive resistance of the person hostile to authority but afraid to fight back. Such students have been released or stimulated to more active response (which is then called "development") by exposure to materials dealing with aggressive attitudes or open expression of hostility, such as can be found in novels like *Crime and Punishment* or in social criticism.

At the risk of duplicating remarks made in another section it can also be pointed out that passivity may be a student's reaction to misplacement in a course with whose materials and methods she feels especially insecure; sometimes this is not understood until a happier placement, in the following semester or the following year, is followed by a "conspicuous development" (chiefly due to the releasing effect of the more congenial methods or materials).

Such patterns of development appear more clearly in a college where extensive records are kept, and they become even more conspicuous when we inspect the total college record of each student. When reports are written approximately every two working months, slumps that might not be apparent on semester reports call for serious attention by faculty and by the Student Work Committee. The work of one student suffers during periods of illness, menstrual difficulties, and anxiety. Another did moderate to good work her first

year; there are comments on brief periods of health difficulties, which in her second year increased enough to pull down her work seriously. Rosamund was excessively tense and badly unadjusted, socially. But her work may have served a compensatory purpose; it was maintained at a good to excellent level, throughout, except for a period of weeks when she had to leave college because of fatigue and hypertension. Beryl gained a sure footing and enough independence during her second year to make a decision about marriage the third year. During this time her work suffered but after her marriage her work improved again. Stella improved steadily during freshman year but in her second year serious differences with her family resulted in more uneven work. So, too, with Sibyl and Madeline, the quality of whose work was superior, although the quantity varied with health and with the demands made upon them by their parents.

These periods of interruption because of physical and family strain are obvious to most teachers. But not all teachers recognize that development comes for different students at different times and in different terms. Herdon comments that Rachel, one of the emotionally limited girls, showed most emotional development in her senior year when she began to work in the nursery school; it is doubtful whether this could have happened, however, before Rachel got her feet on the ground with some security in other college work, as her first year in psychology had reflected a general lack of emotional or purposeful orientation to life. For Phoebe, marked growth came through art; for Hermine, through music.

Sometimes the development which comes through one stimulating area is very dramatic. This was the case with Pauline. Her school record was impressive, but her principal wrote that she had potentialities that needed to be brought out. Her mother apparently agreed, commenting that she had been overshadowed by an older sister. The registration committee was not very favorably impressed; she seemed aggressive, smart, superficial, but also shy. The November reports

already showed the real promise that was in her; she had "definite ideas" in Introduction to the Arts, was "curious," though "immature," in anthropology, and quick, not superficial, with genuine interest in biology. In the next reports outstanding talent appeared in music, as well as technical and artistic skill in biology. For the second semester she maintained a good to excellent record with steady development in all subjects. It was apparent that through the arts she had acquired a strong genuine interest and direction for her development. By the middle of her second year she had composed the first movement of a string quartet. This progress continued through her third year, when she did excellent work in literature as well as music, in spite of her teacher's comment that she was anti-authoritarian. Her sensitivity and imagination are almost as marked in literature as in music. By her fourth year "too many activities and interests"—evidently reflecting an expansion in her life outside of courses—conflicted with time for her work, which was rated only moderately good. In view of the growth in self-confidence generally, this decline in the distinction of her academic work hardly offers ground for disappointment; through release and achievement in one field she became a freer, more secure person.

Especially important is a recognition of the pronounced though belated development of certain girls whose chief common quality is their serious purpose. Such girls may appear in freshman year to be immature, or superficial. Ruth R. seemed hopelessly ill-at-ease, superficial, unadjusted; Sue Sanders seemed scattered, flighty, and distracted by too many interests; Sarah D. seemed slow, inarticulate. All three graduated with substantial, mature, penetrating work behind them, which showed itself more and more consistently after their specific goals became clearly formulated.

Strong purpose in the student, combined with unusually consistent sympathetic handling, resulted in impressive development for Mabel also. At the beginning, she represented

an extreme illustration of a repressed, inhibited, overconscientious girl, and her first reports were of the gloomiest. Ratings indicated negligible to slight achievement in terms of a college level of work. Rigidity characterized not only her work but her bearing and posture, which were unusually stiff. But her earnestness and desire were so great that she won the respect and indefatigable effort of all her faculty, with the result that after three years of mutual coöperation she was not only doing satisfactory work but showed enormously increased independence and strength of personality. In writing, the change was particularly striking; at first so constricted that she seemed without rhythm or aesthetic feeling, or images of any kind, she developed a "flair for sharp perceptions clearly expressed." Unfortunately, illness forced her to leave college the following year and it is therefore impossible to say what the limits of her development would have been.

Florence was another hard-working, concentrated, and "rigid" student with limited imagination; she developed markedly, not so much through concerted effort of teachers as through finding security and release in the arts. After four years, the combination of courses in the arts, music, and the dance resulted in a spontaneity, depth of understanding of people, and poise which would have seemed incredible in her first year.

It is also by no means uncommon for freshmen to receive apparently conflicting reports in different fields of work, a situation which can be understood only as we understand the greater security of the student in one area than in another. Pauline, Hortense, Lottie, Lillian, Beryl, and Celia were all examples of this. The further development of these girls followed two different trends: some, like Celia, settled down to major in the field of their specialty and went on to graduate work, having derived from their college education a concentrated preparation in this field, but little else. Others, like Hortense, also concentrated heavily, but during senior year

showed enormous increase in ability to handle material in fields where, earlier, very poor work had been done. In Hortense's case, sustained work in art led to a maturity of understanding of general aesthetic problems and problems of form, so that at the end she was able to write very well, although, earlier, she had been weakest in this field.

This experience of mastery at a deep level in one field leading to marked development in another took place in many other instances; examples could be drawn from girls for whom work in literature or dramatics prepared the way for a deeper grasp of psychological problems, and the reverse as well—girls whose competence in concrete areas of personality study or work with children led to more mature writing (as in the case of Ruth R.). In all these cases, cumulative experience, usually closely knit and sometimes involving work with the same teacher for two years during some part of the sequence, seemed to be a major factor in the quality of sureness and maturity which carried over to other fields and also to the girl's ability to handle her own problems. When this happens, the result is recognizably different from the results for the girl who merely has a well-balanced program that gives her a "good education."

It is not our task here to consider the administrative implications of this discussion of patterns of growth. "Marks," and even "achievement" ratings, set down at frequent intervals can have little connection with the processes of orientation, the spurts and latency periods in intellectual development which we have observed. It might be more sensible to ask such questions as: "What is this student going through?" "What does this experience mean to her?" "What can teachers in new courses learn of the orientation pattern and stages of growth characteristic of the student as observed by earlier teachers?"

Implications for Guidance

Our questions here relate to the almost universal system of marks which at best are an approximate statement of achievement. What has the student gone through? What did she get out of her experience? If she was confused or disturbed, did this result in greater breadth and a general loosening up of responsiveness or in greater defensiveness? How did the work in each area affect the work in other areas? What patterns of adjustment and learning may possibly be repeated next year? Are there any observations about the tempo and method of achieving orientation that would be helpful to the succeeding group of teachers? Are spurts and plateaus of learning more marked than in the average student? If so, what kinds of teaching experiences help to stimulate a new spurt when she has been on a plateau long enough?

The answers to questions of this sort would help teachers to make their work with students more consistent, more integrated. Mistakes of evaluation could be avoided, and the teacher herself could avoid wasting time in worrying about students who appeared unresponsive in the first months when they were going through characteristic orientation periods typical of each new course.

THE WAYS IN WHICH DEVELOPMENT COMES

IN OUR DISCUSSION of interests and concepts of learning we have frequently indicated that teachers were concerned with something deeper than achievement or success in an area of study or than the understanding of systems of thought. We have spoken of the teachers' conception of "integrated learning," in which attitudes and values are reshaped as the student gains new perspectives, and we have frequently been so bold as to use the easily exploited concept of "development" toward personal maturity. However awkward our descriptions of this process, it has occupied a great deal of attention from teachers and educational committees; therefore, it should be helpful to consider what development means to the students themselves and to the teachers and advisers who were observing them.

Since, as is true among college students generally, many left after the first year and less than 32 percent remained to complete the A.B. degree, we shall have first to consider the nature of the group that remained. Out of the 139 freshmen in one class we studied, 33 left college before or at the end of the first year. Of these, 21 were in the lowest half of the intelligence distribution measured by the American Council Test, 8 were among those who went to the infirmary most frequently, 9 were among those with fewest (bottom quartile) social engagements outside of college, and 7 were in the group with most (top quartile) social engagements outside of college. Of the girls who left college for reasons other than intelligence, health, or social maladjustment, marriage accounted for the withdrawal of 6.

We may contrast this group with those who stayed four years. Out of the 50 who received the A.B., 34 had been in the top half of the distribution of intelligence ratings by the

American Council Test in their freshman year; 19 were in the middle half of the distribution of social engagements in the same year.

Looking at the group of A.B. students through the eyes of the Director of Education, who knew many of them personally and all of them through the long careful discussions of the Student Work Committee, we find several general bases of "development" from the college point of view among those students for whom college had been an experience of growth.

Gains in security are reflected in the comments about students who: "were freer at the end of college, had more initiative"; "got more of a base, a more even keel"; "gained more self-assurance"; "developed skill which gave her a foothold"; "gained confidence, depth, found areas of work really important for her"; "overcame fears; overcame inability to attack things in more than one or two areas; became less negative, lost defenses against feeling of inferiority."

Closely related were comments on increased freedom, depth, reality in relationships with work: "she went into things more deeply at the end"; "her anxiety about a career diminished"; "at first her intellectual interests seemed artificial; her work became more real."

Gains in breadth of areas of interest and response were important here: "her areas of interest broadened"; "areas of warmth grew"; "more participation, rapport, less monosyllabic"; "college opened up much to her"; "less centered now" (greater variety of interests); "college was an awakening" (to new possibilities of interest).

Gains in the quality of relations with others were often associated with greater security: "change from hostility to cooperativeness and fine work"; "became more relaxed, less dominating"; "gradual opening up, deepened relations with other students"; "became more vivacious"; "her resistance softened."

Gains in independence were emphasized in other cases: "she got freed from parents, developed a sound basis for in-

dependence as a person"; "she showed more capacity to handle her own difficulties at the end." For some students gains in self-understanding seemed basic to other aspects of development: "she showed growth in insight and in self-acceptance."

The needs which a student brings to her work are likely to determine the areas in which she will be able to develop most easily. Ida, despite her high intelligence and strong intellectual curiosity, had no definite interest or plan when she came to college; the development of a clear interest in biology was important in the security and strength which she gained in college, and led to a plan for graduate work and a vocation. Irene was at first too easily discouraged by failure to do her best work; the development of steady confidence was related to an increase in her creative ability. The good insight developed by Lucille contributed to the disappearance of personal problems that were urgent in her freshman year. Nancy White, bewildered and nervous at first, achieved clarity and poise. Marian appeared to have little ability to generalize, analyze, or handle abstract processes but developed markedly in these respects. Hermine's extreme negativism interfered with her work, but she grew coöperative and ended with outstanding interest in using her talents for the needs of the college. Alicia began with a narrow, limited viewpoint but ended with a broad awareness of the political and economic world.

By implication, development for different students meant development at points where the student had been weak: fears, anxiety, lack of independence or initiative or confidence, artificial or forced interests, narrow or self-centered approaches, resistance, domination, or tenseness were overcome so the student became a more effective person.

As might be expected, students were not uniformly aware of the kinds of growth observed by the college; they were likely to judge what had happened to them in less personal

ways. Only a few described their college experience in terms like these:

"I have been fighting ever since [the end of my first year] to come back each year . . . because as a person I felt it had been very good for me. I had been very narrow before I came here. . . . I could feel my whole personality and intellectual ability grow. . . . College has given me more self-confidence. . . . When I came to college I was a timid little soul . . . but there is such a change now."

Others described "What I got out of college" in these terms: "I have discovered that everything I have been brought up to believe is not exactly all truth. I have changed practically all my values since I came and have gotten a great deal of concrete knowledge. . . . I learned to question things I had taken for granted before."

". . . a pulling together of yourself . . . came for me at the end of junior year. I just generally enjoyed working. . . . I can always look back with pleasure . . . on things I have accomplished. . . . I have found a lot of interests that I did not know about. For instance music did not come until I was here."

Getting a new basis of security in work was discussed by four other students. A consolidation of a focal interest already started was the chief satisfaction to nine. "Learning to think" was most exciting to five. Others mentioned the satisfaction of a gradual expansion and filling out of interests; the releasing experience of freedom which was "more important than which courses you took"; "the stimulating effect of having to do everything for yourself"; "talking to faculty as equals."

Because of our special concern with the best use of the freshman year, senior students were asked specifically what the first year had meant in the total picture of their development in college. Many spoke of the importance of experimenting in new areas of work: "One thing that is terribly

important is having new fields opened up to me." "I became aware of how much there is that one doesn't know . . . just a general awakening." "I didn't know any more at the end of my first year, except that I knew what I *didn't* want to do. . . . I became aware of what an awful lot of other things there were." "I think it was an awakening and a starting on many tracks of interest that I had not had before mostly. Just a beginning all over again of a new learning about things I had not come into contact with before."

But while some students thought of themselves as happily ready for the stimulation of new courses and ways of working, others remembered their hesitation and caution:

I was a very indefinite person when I came. I didn't know why they took me. . . . I told my adviser what I was going to take and it was more or less a continuation of prep school. . . . I was just interested in a general education, had no definite talents. . . . I was a little afraid of Sarah Lawrence. I knew it was supposed to be very different. . . . I didn't want too much of a change at once, just sort of ease into it a little at a time. . . . My adviser seemed to know just what I wanted.

This cautious, self-protective attitude is quite different from that of another student to whom Sarah Lawrence was also very "different" and who reported that she felt insecure and inadequate her first year:

The change from an orthodox high school where I had graduated . . . I remember the introductory literature course here at college. People would talk of things I had never heard of. I thought they must be people with a great deal of education. I didn't have any difficulty in being happy, it was just a sense of these many things of which I did not know anything. I took people who were freshmen for seniors. I thought everything about me was wrong. I was very naïve.

Others reported that they had felt less insecure intellectually but more insecure socially:

It was not until after spring vacation that I began to like the place. . . . I began making friends after Christmas. At first I was very discontented, consequently I did not bother with people. I had

no intention of coming back for a second year but in the last two weeks I discovered that I liked the place very much and that I wanted to come back. . . . Somehow I just didn't get adjusted as quickly as I should have.

I had never been away from home before; I had lived in the same place all my life. I cried frequently here during my freshman year because I was so homesick. At home I went to a public high school and spent lots of time with boys; I was lost here without them. I almost didn't stay. If it hadn't been for two teachers I would not have stuck it out.

This experience was almost the opposite of that of the well-adjusted girl who despite a serious physical disability came to have important responsibility in student government and the affection of her classmates. She remarked: "I found freshman year very friendly the first month . . . it was so entirely different from the set-up I had been in of having people arranging things and thinking for you. I found it very stimulating."

The sense of confusion upon being thrown into such new ways of doing things, new types of work was the chief feeling of several students:

It is hard to remember how I felt; just that now I am clear and on solid ground.

Freshman year I was just getting my bearings. I wanted to find out about the world and not be specific at that time. (It wasn't until the third year that I was interested in lab work. I could settle down enough to focus on it.)

Having books to read with opposite points of view was very upsetting freshman year. I just couldn't figure out my own point of view. I was all mixed up when I came. Now I feel like an entirely different person.

It took all that year really to adjust myself and find out what to look for.

The important thing to note here is that all these students were girls who finished four years of work, and that for these girls who carried through to the end, the patterns of development varied widely: some girls were immediately stimulated

and expanded in the freedom of the new curriculum while others who eventually showed just as great development were confused and upset.

In the answers to queries about their impression of what contributed to a good outcome we find certain common trends. From the girl's own point of view, one factor in development that stands out more clearly than any other is the *presence of one faculty member who had faith in her and gave support as well as understanding help in curricular guidance:*

It was Mr. — who put me on my feet.

Mrs. — went over things with me and helped me a lot.

Mr. — has a swell way of putting you straight.

Miss — seemed to talk my language pretty well and what I said made sense to her. I was very lucky to have her as don.

I have had wonderful experience with my don. He is always very helpful with suggestions; he has a technique for setting you right.

The kind of help these members of the faculty gave varied greatly, as can be inferred from the discussions in previous chapters. Sometimes it was a dramatic aggressive challenge to the student to enjoy and make use of abilities she had not realized; sometimes it was week-by-week encouragement and careful specific suggestions; sometimes it was an adviser who helped to untangle some knots too complicated for the student to untie herself, or in certain cases helped her make arrangements for long-term treatment.

Students also mentioned courses frequently, and special attention was often given to "exploratory courses" first offered to this group of freshmen as a help toward becoming acquainted with a range of materials and methods of work. Both students who had had an exploratory course and those who had not repeatedly said:

It is terribly important . . . to have new fields opened up to me. I think exploratory courses are very necessary . . . it gives you a chance to find out what you would like to concentrate on sooner

than two years of the hit-and-miss method. I think exploratory courses are not ballyhooed enough. They should be presented as courses to help you find out what you want to do and give you certain facts you can always use. It should be considered just as important as taking a concentrated course.

Is it still required to take an exploratory course? I think that is a very good idea, if you are not quite sure of your field and your field is not too specialized. The field work fitted in with my economics as well. If I had taken a straight psychology or economics course I would not have gotten the connection. Having a course that co-ordinates with so many fields is awfully good.

I think an exploratory course like Miss M's is excellent. They should be required. It got me interested in economics through literature, and I never would have discovered economics otherwise.

I wanted to take something in art but was not sure what I wanted . . . so I took Mr. D's exploratory course and chose ceramics which was just what I wanted. I had never heard of ceramics before and did not know what it was.

Some students who did not have exploratory courses emphasized the general principle: "I think in the first two years you should experiment a great deal." Others, as we have seen, bemoaned the lack of sufficiently varied experience to open up new fields; they felt they had concentrated too much. A group of students who followed throughout all four years the lines they had begun in freshman year found development in terms of the cumulative solidity and maturity of work, and drew therefrom an increasing sense of achievement. Another group continued one or two of their high-school subjects in the first year at college but discovered important new fields during their later work: in some cases they were able "to take" work in certain fields during their last years which they could not have handled at first. Examples of this may be seen in a student who was upset by biology demonstrations, dissection and the like, in her freshman year, but went back enthusiastically in her sophomore year; or another student who was too timid to take psychology her freshman year, but reported favorably on her psychology

course senior year. Another student, very constrained during her freshman year, had expanded enough by senior year to enjoy a course in music which would have been impossible for her earlier. For a third group, the main line of direction changed as new fields of greater significance opened up, or as their abilities failed to sustain advanced work in a field that had been rewarding in the elementary stages.

Let us look at some of these sequences as we get them from the schedules of the students and their own comments as seniors:

Abigail began with special interest in literature and psychology, then found that "some of the questions I wanted to answer I could get at best in economics." She ends her four years in social science and literature.

Hermine began with literature, psychology, and music "because it seemed harmless," and ended with plans for graduate work in music in which her instructor discovered real talent.

Priscilla began with music as a hopeful interest but found that beyond a certain point she couldn't progress further. She found literature more satisfying.

Francine began with a plan to prepare for law and concluded with a major in economics, which she decided was the most important background for it.

Ida began with diffuse interests and ended with plans for graduate work after a satisfying experience in biology.

Ursula began with work in history and literature, feeling inferior to an extremely gifted brother. Once past her own feeling of inferiority, she specialized in music, in which her own gifts were more important than she had realized.

Dorothy began with a general idea of getting "background"; an interest in literature and capacity for organization and detail led to a plan for library work.

Janet began with music and literature; her shift to politics and economics grew out of questions raised in her literature course.

Joanna began with a "general feeling of wanting things" and ended with writing and social science.

Rebecca began with an intensive social science background, a general desire for knowledge. She ended with a plan for graduate work in psychology along with an irresistible drive and interest in theory and creative writing.

One significant thing about these sequences is that some students started—we may add, needed to start—with courses offering an opportunity for personal expression (music) or for analysis of personal problems (psychology) and only later came to the discussion of objective problems of social institutions and movements; other students followed a reverse sequence. We can suggest the hypothesis that some students need to begin with personal problems and get past them, as it were, through solving them, while other students need security in objective terms before they can admit that they have problems, or can begin to confront them. Some students must have a measure of objective security before they can “let themselves go” in any form of personal expression such as music or art. Similarly, some students must begin with “something you can hang onto,” definite, observable, dependable facts; later they can go on to the discussion of implications, theories that interpret factual material. Other students must begin with more theoretical courses and gradually become able to see the “meaning” in facts and field observations which may have seemed trivial and unimportant at first.

The teacher’s understanding of points at which a student needs to take hold and the direction in which she is moving were important factors in the degree of satisfaction with work, and the freedom to grow, of various members of this class. Programs are not to be thought of solely in terms of the general area of interest; the problem of curricular guidance is more precise than this. It is a matter of the specific purposes, approaches, and difficulties with which the student begins, and their relation to the direction which later emerges for her.

While it is generally recognized that strains connected with parental domination, anxiety about boy friends or social adjustment at college interfere, sometimes very seriously, with good work (admittedly they also may stimulate a student to more searching work), it is not always recognized that

resolution of a basic emotional problem, rather than the "right courses," may be the chief factor to account for "marked development" in work. Progress toward independence from parents, a definite decision about a pending engagement or actual marriage have appeared in the records as prelude to better work, characterized by "more initiative," better written work, more perspective. For instance Beryl was excessively painstaking, laborious and hard-working; she tended to get lost in details. Her reports the first year varied from Moderate (minus) to Good. The second year she reveals more humor, ingenuity, imagination, and critical ability, and is rated Good most of the time. During her third year, when she is involved in the decision about her engagement and marriage, she is criticized again rather sharply and her ratings are variable: She doesn't concentrate, seems careless, lacks unity and continuity, is "not able to formulate what she has seen and felt." But in the same year her "appreciation is broadened" and she shows "fine perception." By the beginning of her fourth year she is married, appears to be steadier and her teachers comment that she no longer gets bogged down in details; all her ratings are Good.

Just as the student's achievement in work is only part of the whole picture of her growth, college is merely part of her total life situation. The latter can be evaluated in the light of answers to the question "How do the various aspects of the student's life in college and out of college contribute to her development during these four years?" In order to check on some of the hypotheses emerging from the detailed study of records, the faculty group as a whole was given an opportunity to check "important examples of intellectual and personality development." Also to be checked were "students who had difficulties seriously interfering with work or social relations," and students who were "comfortably well adjusted." The check-up resulted in distinguishing the following groups:

1. Students with difficulties seriously interfering with work or social relations who also showed marked personality or intellectual development. (These were compared with 2.)
2. Students with difficulties who did not show marked personality or intellectual development (31 out of 40 of these left college before their third year).
3. Comfortably well-adjusted students who showed marked personality or intellectual development. (These were compared with 4.)
4. Comfortably well-adjusted students not rated as showing marked personality or intellectual development (15 out of 19 of these left by their third year).

This reinforces what we have seen, that difficulties *per se* are less serious hazards for personality and intellectual development than the student's way of dealing with them and their place in her total life. The important question is not so much what problems does she have but "How does she handle them?" and "Will she grow?" "Are her difficulties the most important thing about her, or do they seem incidental to a personality and life full of good possibilities?"

Three fifths of the students who showed marked personality and intellectual development, and who stayed in college, had serious difficulties. The reverse is also true: some students having had no severe traumas or obvious difficulties may be empty and apparently incapable of growth. Life without problems does not necessarily contribute to development.

If we ask what helped these students to grow we find that the capacity to work and respond to what the college offers is central. The typical pattern of curriculum for these showing marked growth is a pattern of balanced concentration in one field and a spread through other fields—an area of work carried through four years supplemented by a course or two in three or four other areas. Such a pattern reflects the students' ability to explore, along with a capacity for deep and thorough mastery in one field. These capacities may be released or frustrated by emotional reactions to problems con-

fronted by the student.¹ We may think, then, of more productive and less productive emotional responses to difficulty. Some students develop attitudes and ways of dealing with life that are unproductive: a passive, unresponsive attitude toward all college life and work; a tense overmoral approach; an overmeticulous concern with details to the exclusion of central ideas and problems. We shall see in a later chapter that the ability to respond to varied educational experiences, including the capacity for cumulative growth in a field, may be a matter of personality, and that shy, or insecure girls, immature but growing girls, "unawakened" students, openly hostile girls, and those with surface problems not surrounded by rigid defenses are apt to develop in college even when they seem less promising at the start; on the other hand, strongly defensive characters with extensive areas of rigidity, extremely anxious girls, extremely dependent, passive ones, girls with striking lack of energy or drive, and girls with hostility so deeply repressed that faculty do not recognize it are more apt to be among those who do not "show marked personality and intellectual growth."

While general personality structure may be more or less favorable to development, specific motivations within a given personality also vary in their likelihood of releasing productiveness or stimulating growth. Interests dictated by a parent, or conditioned upon temporary current dinner-table talk, or attractive for their prestige value, or stimulated by the desire to prove ability are less likely to result in growth than interests rooted in questions important to the student herself, or those emerging from immediate satisfaction in processes and activities such as singing, painting, caring for children, working in a laboratory, or those motivated by a desire to get background or skills necessary for pursuing a desired vocation or avocation.

Oddly enough, records of students who grow normally and comfortably in college are almost never as adequate as records

¹ Cf. Virginia and Anne, pp. 380 and 367.

of students whose development disappoints their teachers. It is the latter records which form the main basis of the next several chapters; these discuss and evaluate the kinds of problems that often interfere with development valued by the teachers.

Implications for Guidance

The findings in this chapter are intimately related to those in the preceding chapters, where we discussed patterns of interest, attitudes toward and ways of learning. Here we see the way in which development depends on the points at which a given student needs to grow, is ready to grow, and is free to grow. There is no tidy formula that guarantees growth in all students; we cannot even say that intellectual achievement must precede personal development, nor, conversely, that the achievement of personal security must precede intellectual growth.

The teacher guiding the student will keep in mind not only the questions about the meaning of her interests, her attitudes toward learning, and patterns of orientation which we have discussed, but, further, these questions about the terms in which development is possible for her.

What are the areas in which her previous experience and development have made her relatively mature and what are the areas in which development is most needed? What obstacles—inhibitions, anxieties, resistances, dependences on family or home-town securities—are likely to interfere with development in these areas? What levers are accessible for teachers to use: curiosities, problems she wants to solve, steadiness of purpose, capacity to identify with broader values and personalities? What guesses can be made about the order in which different aspects of development may come and ways in which different kinds of stimulation should be timed?

THE ROLE OF "PROBLEMS" IN LEARNING

IN THE NEXT five chapters we shall discuss the different ways in which problems may affect a student's work and development. The records of two classes of freshmen showed that with some students difficulties occur in very specific areas while with others a more general or pervasive pattern of adjustment has formed a character structure reflected in virtually every area of their lives. Among the first group we can distinguish some whose problems crop up in the areas of health and social relations and others whose problems appear chiefly in the area of work. To a teacher who thinks of students as individuals, difficulties of health, social life, family strains are the problems that first come to mind; we shall, then, begin with these and later go on to other approaches to students' problems in college.

Because of the need to respect the confidences of the student we do not discuss family backgrounds extensively in detail in most of the case studies in Part II. Checking through 25 intensive case studies we found that 14 of the 25 girls had experienced death of a parent, divorce of the parents, or extremely strained relations between parents and children. Illustrations of the ways in which early troubles can affect the student's adjustment at college are seen in Lucille, disturbed about a family scandal and always uncertain whether she was as secure and as popular in the college group as she should be; Peggy, whose brother was described by her and another student as a serious problem; Hazel, so worried about the hostile atmosphere between children and parents in her home that her conferences were dominated by discussion of it. In another instance, Carol's inability to face reality objectively in relation to course material seemed to be a direct reflection of her experience in family relationships; and the

same summary might be made of Beatrice. Harriette's hostility to teachers appeared to be a direct reflection of hostility toward domineering adults at home; Laura's insecurity was rooted partially in social disorientation following the failure of her father in business; Sonia's scattered flights from one topic to another seemed to reflect a deep anxiety grown from the death of one parent and the lifelong illness of another.

Severe physical difficulties occurred in two instances. Great social strain occasioned by ambiguity of social status or collapse of family economic security existed in 3 cases, while anxiety over adoption, family sex problems, or the consequences of a temporary break in the family appeared in 3 additional cases.

It seems fair to point out the "normal" character of severely disturbing experiences by the age of entrance to college. Approximately no more than one third of a freshman class has reached college age without having to confront major family, social, or physical difficulties. The normal college girl has lived through something; frequently she brings her problems to college with her. In two previous volumes we have given many illustrations of the use of social science and literature to help her attain the perspective and ability to view her problems objectively.¹ It must be obvious to readers of these reports that serious problems are important in motivating work directed toward an understanding of them. We have already noted that for some students the attack on solving problems may come in freshman year, after which the student goes ahead to more objective types of work; for other students the same problems may seem too painful for discussion in freshman year. Such students may be able to talk about their problems when they have become generally secure in their college work; still others may never be able to discuss their family difficulties while in college.

¹ Esther Raushenbush, *Literature for Individual Education* (New York, 1942); Lois B. Murphy, Eugene Lerner, Jane Land Judge, and Madeleine Grant, *Psychology for Individual Education*, ed. Esther Raushenbush (New York, 1942).

Social Life during Freshman Year

While faculty, even dons who mean to be concerned with the student's whole life, were often busy chiefly with problems of intellectual development and the student's curriculum, freshmen in general were very often concerned with the number of week ends they could wangle. In a college very close to a metropolis and to other colleges and having a sizeable number of students within five or six hours of home by train, it is natural that frequent week-end leaves should be the rule. In each class studied, half the students had "blue slips" or permissions to stay away from college overnight. Students who had more than twenty-eight or less than ten blue slips were out of step with the group—in the former case they "ran around all the time" (unless the slips covered routine trips to near-by home); in the latter case they probably were at a long distance from home, had few or no girl friends here at college who lived near by, and neither boy friends nor girl friends at near-by colleges. Since few week ends meant these things they often meant "Other girls know I haven't many friends," or "I am not popular or even well liked." And the feeling of not being liked might well be a source of anxiety that carried over into work. But anxiety about social life was not confined to girls with less than ten week ends. Records on Lucille, Mildred, and Ruth P. who all had more than an average number of week ends reflected similar anxiety about social life.

Looking at the records of blue slips as a whole, no clear connection appears between the amount of time spent away from college and success in college. Almost exactly the same proportion of girls remaining in college for one, two, three, and four years appeared in the group with the *most* blue slips as in that with the least. Among those who stayed four years there is no statistically reliable difference in the American Council on Education Test Scores between those who

left college most frequently and those who left least often. It is clear that a large number of the girls who leave most frequently (top quartile for "blue" slips) live within two hours' driving distance from the college; but it would hardly be fair to say that "going home" provided less competition to college work than did going to a game, for some of the girls who lived near home carried considerable responsibility for family needs. The fairest conclusion appears to be that the frequency of leaving college was not particularly important, as such, for this class. What was important was the significance of life inside and outside of the college to the individual student. Helen M. who left most often was deeply absorbed in her family; but they in turn were deeply interested in her college work. At home, discussions of economics and the social science exploratory course contributed to her excitement over college work, and, conversely, what she got at college stimulated discussions at home. Carolyn, on the other hand, leaving college only an average number of week ends, frequently went home to a family not particularly interested in education; all the talk centered on a sister who was planning to get married. By June, Carolyn herself had acquired a fiancé and was a runner-up for family attention. We can go straight down the list of the class in order of number of week ends and find, side by side from top to bottom, girls who were profiting deeply from college and who stayed four years along with girls whose interest was superficial and who left after a year or two.

Social life, then, must be seen in terms of what went into it, how it was related to the student's whole pattern of living in college, and what it meant to her. An approach more telling than that of numbers of week ends or days away is suggested by the comments of the night matron who "registered" students in and out. In her own rule-of-thumb way she commented on certain girls as "boy-crazy," girls at the other extreme who "didn't have enough boy friends," and girls who

appeared to her to be unhappy. If we accept her judgment at face value and check on the subsequent history of students she labeled as "boy-crazy" or having no boy friends, we find:

"Boy-crazy" girls do not generally stay in college more than two years.

Girls who have no boy friends do not generally stay in college more than two years.

In addition we find that:

Among freshmen with "no boy friends" those who stayed in college four years were the students with strong clear interests. Most of the girls considered "not happy" stayed two years or less.

The blue and yellow slips themselves often reveal efforts made to fill the gap: girls who do not often visit friends at colleges sometimes go to the city for "shopping" as often as ten or twelve Saturdays a year, whereas girls who have dates seldom record "shopping" as the reason for going to town. (Not that you need fewer clothes if you have more dates, but that in all likelihood you pick them up on the fly, and shopping is incidental, not an excuse for a day in town.) Occasionally a student with a limited number of friends will cultivate faculty, or adult friends of her family; or her family will come to visit her more often, or she will go home more often than she otherwise might. A few students filled the gap with invented tales of glamorous exploits; others merely kept themselves very busy with work. Even these gap-fillers may not help much if a girl gets no letters, or none she can read to her roommate, and is the kind of girl who needs to be one of the crowd in this respect.

Back of these solutions of college-age social problems lie aches and tensions, hours of planning and daydreaming that interfere with work. Small wonder that girls with too few boy friends are just as likely *not* to stay in college for more than a year or two as are girls with too many boy friends. Having no social life may be even more distracting to intellectual development than having too much. On the other

hand, if a student has strong intellectual interests or is gifted in a special field, either her own deep interest in her work (Madeline) or her appeal to the faculty (Rebecca) may constitute values important enough to offset the humiliations of too few week ends.

This emphasis upon the social pressure to have boy friends may seem to neglect the importance of real problems regarding plans and preparation for marriage, engagements with their own difficulties, and other aspects of boy-girl relations. While it is true that many illustrations could be given of periods when work and all other interests were neglected because of current marriage-decision problems, there is little evidence that such decisions exercised a long-time interference with work. To be sure, in a number of instances marriage terminated college work, though sometimes only temporarily. Where this does not occur, a definite plan for marriage often stimulated added interest in adult questions and brought a more mature approach to problems of citizenship, family life, and scientific matters associated with the fiancé's vocation.

Although important not only for itself but because it carries over to campus status during the week, social life in terms of week ends is not the only problem that competes with studies. On-campus social adjustment is a problem for five days a week; it is just as important as the two-day week end. For some girls campus adjustment comes through congenial friendships in the dormitory; for others through responsibility in college activities, such as the weekly paper, student government activities, dramatics, proms, or clubs. These activities are reported in one way or another in *The Campus* (the weekly paper). It is interesting to check in the files those freshmen who received attention for campus activities and to compare them with students having a satisfactory or unsatisfactory week-end life, and also with those who were later in the course considered well adjusted or as having "difficulties seriously interfering with work or social life."

For the status of the last-named group the college is partly

at fault. It would seem that administrative changes to provide a greater variety of group activities on campus, or further assistance from advisers in entering those that do exist, would take care of a larger proportion of students. That participation in group activities by only 60 percent of the freshmen was tolerated may be largely explained by the fact that class groups themselves have a certain social value. Exploratory courses often develop a family or club atmosphere; a friendly, sometimes filial, attitude toward the teacher may be accentuated when field trips by students and teacher together are a regular part of the work.

Sources of strain on campus are different for different students: D.G. complained of homesickness chiefly because she had gone to a co-ed prep school and was used to having boys in classes and to daily companionship with them. T.L. came from a progressive school background and found the girls here "cliquey" and hard to get acquainted with. M.K. felt a conflict between values emphasized in classwork and those that were patently dominant outside of class. Scholarship students who were also socially shy were sometimes apt to emphasize money difficulties more than those who made friends easily. One senior gave a vivid account of the experience she had freshman year:

While academically going to a progressive high school is good training, I think for going on to Sarah Lawrence it is not the best training socially. Although I knew more about how to get intensive work done I did not know anything about the mechanics of living together in dormitory life which was the most natural thing in the world for boarding school kids. I had always lived at home with my family and brought people home and had a very good social life, but the family was a center, and here trying to switch all of a sudden to make the girls the center was very hard. What helped me there for one thing, was that I did gradually—not in the first three months—feel I was in with a group of kids who thought the way I did and enjoyed doing the same things. I did work very hard in A.S.U. partly because I believed in it. . . . Also it seemed the most simple legitimate way I could get in contact with other kids. I had no idea at all then of just sitting around and talking for an

evening with people. I didn't know of the whole casual approach. I felt I had to get acquainted in a very structuralized way, i.e., to try to get the girls to work in the A.S.U. and to join it—that was for me the easiest type of social approach to make. What also contributed a lot to social adjustment was having the particular don I had. Miss B. did treat me as an equal and I saw a good deal of her off campus and through her got on terms of equality with others of the faculty. In a sense it was probably compensatory for lack of full social adjustment with other girls, to be calling faculty members by their first names and see them in their homes, etc.—still I think it carried me through the year.

The most important thing, it would seem to me, during the first three months, was the sense of vagueness. By Christmas I was pretty overcome by pressure on work, by the feeling of "Here I don't know anything and there is so much to know generally," and the feeling in the four subjects I was taking that I could never catch up. Along with that specific sense of academic pressure I had, there was a sense of vagueness about people, about what group I belonged to and when I was wanted and when I was not.

Some girls who would have preferred not to go away so often felt a lack of planned activities during week ends. Munroe has discussed in some detail the problems presented by social life of these students.²

All dons, to be sure, were expected to be responsible for an overview of the student's program, and to know the relation of each part of the student's work to her total program and to her social life. Records by dons of the entering classes we studied are voluminous and reflect the wide range of experiences that an adviser must keep in mind in judging the student's progress. Mr. B. notes that M.B.'s work tends to fall back after periodic visits of her mother who is depressed and is separated from her husband. Mrs. B. records that H.J.'s work is usually stimulated after visits to a near-by men's college. J.B.'s adviser is aware of serious personal problems but gives good evidence that J.B. will be able to handle them more directly after she has a better footing in her col-

² Ruth Munroe, *Teaching the Individual* (New York, 1942).

lege work; A.C.'s adviser comes to the conclusion that her work cannot improve until she has achieved more clarity in regard to her relations with her parents. The social life of the student was important not primarily in quantitative terms, then. (We have seen that the number of week ends was no clue to the number of years a student would stay in college.) Qualitatively it was important in these terms: if her social life was an expression of her own desires and contributed to her happiness it was also likely to contribute to her development. When it was an expression of unhappiness, frustration, or excessive concern with boy friends or parents, it often interfered with her college work.

Health

Thorough physical examinations of these students indicated that they were in a superior group in regard to general health, nutrition, and freedom from defects. Against this background, the health life of students at college varied through just as wide a range as did the social life. Few of the freshmen turned up at the infirmary less than five times during the year, and the range ran up to a high point of 50 times. Nose and throat troubles, menstrual irregularities, constipation and digestive troubles, eyestrain and fatigue, superficial skin eruptions were the most common complaints. Menstruation for 33 girls in one class of 139 was a casual function attended by little or no pain or discomfort; for 55 girls it was a period of more or less severe pain, headaches, or nausea; the remaining number made no comment. While most students menstruate 4 or 5 days, 16 reported a duration of 3 days or less, and 22 reported 6 days or more. Possible implications of some of these items are suggested by the fact that of 16 girls concerning whom the doctor made notations of neurotic behavior only two had records of average menstrual behavior; 11 showed either unusually slight or unusually long or markedly irregular menstrual periods. The notation of neurotic behavior usually accompanied records of sleeplessness, head-

aches, digestive difficulties, easy fatigability, tendency to worry about health. Since menstrual difficulties ordinarily went along with such troubles, we have no way of knowing which is cart and which is horse.

Many advisers were aware of these things, and alert to the fact that while one student's strain takes the form of compulsive social life and that of another is expressed in blocked or overmeticulous work, the tension of a third is related to proneness to colds, gastric disturbances, or fatigue. But advisers were less likely to be aware of the maturity history of each student. In this class, some students experienced their first menstruation at 10, others, at 16. While there is no complete correlation between body or skeletal maturity and puberty, there is a tendency for those who achieve mature height early to menstruate early. Early menstruation is a partial index of development; it is related to the maturing of sex functions and secondary sex characteristics, and the emotional attitudes associated with them in our culture. What this means for the group of freshmen is that girls who menstruated at 10 or 11 had a longer period of getting accustomed to themselves as young women, of trying out their feelings and relations to boys and men, in so far as this was part of their social life. Girls who matured more slowly were sometimes less poised in their relations with boys, and, unless some compensating factors entered in, were less used to themselves as nearly adult.

The meaning of brief or long, early or late, menstruation to the individual girl probably depends on her information and the attitudes of her group. A girl who thinks of the length of the menstrual period as an index of adequate feminine functioning may not object to a long period, whereas a girl who thinks of it as a nuisance may be irritated by it: a short period may mean inadequate vitality as a woman to some, and others may welcome it as a decreased bother and interruption to activities. Some girls exploited the menstrual period as an excuse to get out of unpleasant assignments; others ignored

it or made a special, even extreme, effort not to let it interfere with their usual activity. When a girl regularly misses class or conferences because of menstruation, her adviser is aware of it, but there is otherwise little occasion for an adviser to know what role menstrual reactions play in the student's life, or what their relation is to other difficulties. Student attitudes also differed toward other physical ills; one girl constantly sought advice for an ailment that another would ignore.

In view of the wide variations in the number of visits to the infirmary it seemed desirable to see whether this might be an index related to success in college. Inspection of the nature of these visits suggested, however, that it would be unsound to use the number of infirmary contacts as an index of health to compare with the length of time a student remained in college. One student, with a very high number of infirmary visits, actually abounded in vigor and merely used the infirmary as a dependable source of attention. Another student, who made a much smaller number of contacts, was forced to leave college for two months in her senior year because of hypertension and thyroid disturbance. Nevertheless, with this reservation in mind, it will still be useful to look at those students with the largest number of infirmary contacts. The numbers are too small for statistical reliability but the trend seems consistent: 5 out of 11 students on the top 10 percent of such contacts stay in college only one year. Out of these 11 only two finish four years of college.

A more impressive comparison appears when we look at the students noted by the physician as "nervous" or "neurotic" at the time of the initial physical examination. Out of 13 girls in this group only one completed an A.B. and she required extra work to do so.

We may conclude that in certain extreme cases (the top 10 percent) specific health difficulties interfered with staying in college, although the students were able to complete their college work in spite of real health problems. More serious was the presence of a vague anxiety in the form of general

nervousness or neuroticism. This was more damaging to the chances of completing an A.B. than specific health symptoms.

We may conclude, then, that particular health problems are less significant than the role they play in the student's life, and her attitude toward them. When they are an expression of an inadequate, anxious approach to the main problems of her life, they may run parallel with failure, but not as a cause of failure, since we find other students with equally severe problems who succeed. An adequate approach to health, would then require a close integration of work with mental-health and physical-health problems in the college. Health education is often discussed in terms of sleep, nutrition, and management of colds, but this approach is not likely to be very effective unless it becomes part of an effort to help students to understand the interrelation of physical and emotional well-being.

Implications for Guidance

The war and the dislocations following it are likely to increase the frequency of family disturbances and problems of heterosexual adjustment which are affecting and will have been part of the experience of college students of the years ahead. Whatever these difficulties are, their probable effects on students will depend, in the future as in the past, on how each student deals with her own difficulties. The role of the guiding teacher will vary from one student to another, but always with this direction: to help the student to feel and think constructively about her experience. In some instances reassurance, in others a challenge, in still others help in analysis of the experience will be most helpful, depending on whether the student has been traumatized, discouraged, or confused by what has happened to her. In the case of any difficulty, whether in the area of family relationship, health or social problems, the student's adviser will want to ask: How is this student dealing with her problem? What does it mean to her? Is it a hurdle to be passed, an insuperable ob-

stacle, a spur to greater effort, a stimulus to emotional indulgence and self-pity, an excuse for lack of effort? Has it made her life chaotic and left her without a sense of control? Has she responded by overestimating or underestimating her own importance as an individual? What can help her take a long view? What assets for sturdy self-help does she have? Should work be set aside until this problem is solved, or will the problem be solved more efficiently if she concentrates more vigorously on her work?

The answers to questions of this sort will also be relevant to the matter of admission to college, since it is often futile for a student with ineffective approaches to her problems to attempt to carry college work.

DIFFICULTIES WITH SPECIFIC TYPES OF WORK

Writing and Reading

AT Sarah Lawrence College the evaluation of work falls heavily upon specific oral and written reports of research, observation, reading, or whatever the student has been doing as her work in the course; these reports are one of the chief bases for evaluation of student work in many fields. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that difficulties in writing appear as a recurrent problem among students of many different interests and levels of ability. Among the repeated complaints found in teachers' reports are the following:

The student refuses to write; she tries to avoid long papers wherever possible.

She writes sporadically, at times extremely well.

She organizes her ideas well, but persistently ignores facts and detailed basis or evidence for the conclusions.

She has difficulties with broad outlines and theoretical integrations; tends to get swamped in too much detail.

She accepts certain forms of writing, refuses others.

We shall not discuss at length the assumptions underlying the use of writing, or the assumptions that college education involves: the achievement of competence with different forms; the ability to write regularly; and to integrate concrete material, such as facts or observations, with organized generalizations. However debatable these assumptions may be they do actually underlie much of the teaching effort at this college as at many other colleges. Undoubtedly for certain students, any or even all of these demands may be irrelevant at certain times; in some instances they may be irrelevant to the best development of the student throughout her college years. Just as certain information may be more relevant to

the needs of one student than to those of another, certain intellectual techniques may also vary in their value for different students.

The following observations are drawn from records of students in social science and literature courses where the demands for written work were most inexorable. The first group of students, those who tried to avoid writing, included these examples:

One who had high standards and felt that she did not know how to attain them was helped by concentrated individual assistance in writing. She progressively gained security so that she wrote an elaborate case report her sophomore year and as a graduate student and teacher, later, it was no longer a problem.

Two of the group were unusually secure in motor and social activity and in ability to live out their ideas; thinking and action were never divorced. Written work was frustrating because the standards they could easily meet in the field of action were so far beyond what they could meet in the area of writing.

Another similarly was skillful in a variety of mechanical "non-verbal" areas and insecure in all verbal material, but especially in written work.

In a very few instances difficulties in vision affected written work as well as reading.

The next group is quite different. It comprises those who write sporadically, even well at times. There are no girls in it of outstanding social and athletic or mechanical ("non-verbal") gifts, but there are girls of emotional intensity whose sporadic pattern applies to other aspects of work besides writing, although it is most conspicuous there. Rebecca was extremely ambitious. Whenever she wrote anything the results were impressive, but she could not write unless she was ready to produce at a near-professional level. Like Anne, she also carried a tremendous emotional freight, which made stream-lined intellectual production during her early years in college impossible. The working out of her own problems made no small contribution to her subsequent professional development; that is, she later achieved a deeper integration

of her own emotional and intellectual development with the vocational life than most students who performed more serenely in their early college years.

The next three groups are related to each other in that they all include students whose approach to writing appears to their teachers to be limited:

Two write in sufficiently well-organized fashion but ignore facts while others get lost in details. One wrote poetry and refused to write critical reports. Other difficulties in writing appear among students who wish to write, do not refuse to tackle any assignments, but succeed only in producing unorganized notes, phrases, and awkward compressed sentences. In one case progress did not appear until the fourth year when the student produced one long, solid paper which showed "amazing gain in expression and control." In other instances the dramatic fulfillment of efforts did not come during the college course.

Other evidence in the college files often rounded out the picture shown by the writing itself. One student who wrote very poorly at the same time showed security in non-verbal material; this same discrepancy appeared in the American Council Test, where her percentile score in language and verbal areas was only 8 as compared with a percentile score of 72 in the scientific and mechanical area. With certain students whose difficulty was that of sporadic writing—and not the consistent inability to cope with writing problems—the test scores were high precisely in the verbal areas. We have already indicated that, in the case of these students and others like them, unresolved but ultimately productive emotional problems were the basic factors rather than lack of ability.

Many students who cannot integrate or synthesize factual or detailed material with organized conclusions have no obvious limitations of ability, nor are there obvious emotional roots of the problem.

Difficulties of this sort are not, of course, confined to work at the college level. The Rorschach test is concerned with the "relation of details to whole interpretations" at all levels of personality and intellectual development. Excessive preoccupation with detail *may* be an evidence of anxiety. Excessive search for integrated whole interpretations *may* be an

indication of extreme ambition, but when such interpretations result from vagueness, this would not be the case. Insecurity or anxiety may be expressed in many ways, of which vagueness is one. At a more optimistic level, whole interpretations may show insight and capacity for an integration that is not available to the individual who clings to details.

Differences of this kind also appear in sharp relief in the Binet test of children: some anxious children retreat from tasks requiring thought or criticism (comprehension tests, absurdity tests), and seek their security in the comfortable solidity of routine tasks like the so-called rote memory tests. Others do exactly the opposite. The rote memory tests involve rigid attentiveness and give little scope for emotional overflow, so that certain tense children fail these through several age levels, although they succeed beyond their own age in tests calling for a leap of insight or comprehension.¹ Tentatively we may assume that intellectual behavior of this sort emerges from an underlying adjustment syndrome in which the thinking patterns have been shaped at a deep level by the individual method of dealing with anxiety (see pp. 137 ff.).

Difficulties with reading are also to be expected where so little teaching takes the form of lecturing and so little learning takes the form of listening; a large proportion of the work depends on the student's own reading. Some of these difficulties are inherent in a program of, say, three reading courses, each of which may involve a large amount of reading per week. This appears in a variety of forms:

- students who cannot read rapidly enough to handle two or three courses requiring a large amount of reading per week;
- those who read superficially and unreflectively;
- students who try to avoid reading altogether, by taking courses in arts, laboratory, field work and the like;

¹ These observations are based upon unpublished data of the author. I understand that David Rapaport has an extended discussion of this problem in a forthcoming volume.

those who will read concrete material but have difficulties with any kind of technical or abstract material.

In some cases these difficulties appear to be the result of inept training; in other cases they appear to be more deeply related to a basic personality pattern in which other activities are valued highly and there is strong emotional resistance to reading. A report on reading problems as they appear in this college will be available some time in the future.

Field Work and Laboratory Observation

Just as the heavy demands for written work throw into focus some common difficulties which might not appear in such sharp relief at another college, so the large amount of laboratory, field work, and observation also tends to stimulate a sharper inspection of students' difficulties in these areas when they appear.

Mrs. Lynd's study of field work ² will discuss certain difficulties; for the present we can note that students who find contacts with new people difficult are apt to dislike field work which necessitates such contacts. Perhaps a special case of this may be seen in psychology students who are "afraid of children" or feel ill-at-ease with them and thus avoid contacts with children as part of their psychology work. Other students, who learn more easily via theoretical or textbook material, resist field work along with every other kind of work that requires close attention to concrete situations and data. Still other students prefer the observation and concrete experiences of field work to the exclusion of necessary reading.

Patterns of response to laboratory work as distinguished from theoretical aspects of science follow somewhat different lines from these. Contacts with people are here less directly involved; manual coördination, however, may be very important. Thus, one girl who had difficulties in the area of social science writing was able to do excellent work in the

² Helen M. Lynd, "Field Work in College Education" (in preparation).

biology laboratory; she enjoyed both the manual processes of dissection and the opportunity for firsthand observation which it afforded. By contrast, another student dropped things, trembled at her ineptitude, and avoided laboratory conferences. A large group of students were "heavy plodders" at laboratory work in physics, doing busy work with little or no satisfaction; others were indifferent; another group was enthusiastic.

In biology some girls with special gifts for reproducing their observations in drawings were especially devoted to laboratory work. Consciousness of ineptitude and lack of skill was no more important a deterrent to laboratory activity than were strong emotional attitudes toward the focus of the activity. There are a few examples of students for whom dissection of animals opened up intensely emotional problems of death, sex and reproduction, and the physiology of basic life processes. In certain instances so much dread and anxiety about these matters had accumulated that the student could not face the direct biological approach to them. In other cases a factual discussion relieved the student's tension and contributed to a healthier adjustment to the questions so heavily charged with feeling at first.

Under a system of prescribed courses plus electives it is often nobody's business what a student "takes" as long as it fits the pattern. Where there are no official prescriptions, however, choices of program involve not only the student's preference and the adviser's judgment regarding her ability but also the adviser's notion of what she "needs" in order to "adjust to a changing culture," or to "cope with reality," or to be a "well-rounded person," or to "become mature."

Recent trends in education, both operational and philosophical, have been close to the social sciences, so it is not surprising that teachers here should be "social-science" minded to the point of thinking that economics or psychology or politics or social philosophy is important for some, if not all, of the aims mentioned in the foregoing paragraph. The

result is a large reservoir of observations regarding students' objections to such courses:

Those students who share a lack of interest in, or resistance to, social problems and human values, resist all courses in the social-science area. With one there is no lack of concern with human problems but a distinct avoidance of theoretical work which keeps her away from social-science courses; another avoids this field because its problems are too exciting and disturbing to her, while still another refuses work in politics or history because she has strong preferences for economics and feels there is no time for other work in social science.

In spite of the fact that we live in a "technological era," most girls do not gravitate toward the natural sciences. They seem to be impressed by the fact that it is easier to get someone else to adjust their carburetors than to solve their personal problems. However, this is not the only reason, since the entering classes on whom this study is largely based were particularly deficient in ability in mathematics or science, and these areas of work would have been especially difficult and uncongenial to them.

"Scatter" and "Specialization"

Without the mechanical coercion of curricular "requirements" a student's program does not always achieve a balance between breadth and concentration, despite the efforts of her adviser, her teachers and the Student Work Committee. But this possible loss is probably compensated by the enormous increase in insight as to the sources of the drive to "spread around," or to "focus exclusively on" a given area of work. We shall see in the example of Louise (see p. 206) how the varied and apparently unfocused program arose from her uncertainty, each year, about whether she would be allowed to come back, and also from a deeper difficulty in relating herself or giving herself to any important interest. In Priscilla's case (see p. 274) some "scatter" was due to a transient desire to prove her skill in one area—

biology; after she had done this, she had no further need or desire for study in the field. In the case of Judith (see p. 339) the shift from one area to another followed a shift from a field (sculpture) which was a compensation for supposed incompetence in intellectual areas in which her sister was distinguished, to a field (social science) which was on her sister's ground. When less is known about the student, the motivations for scattered areas of work may not be clear; at the level of explanation by the student, reasons are usually stated in such terms as: "I want to get in a little of everything," "I want to learn as much as possible." It is possible that a deeper study might indicate a drinking in or a dependent attitude as a basis of this tendency to taste everything, in contrast to a greater drive to mastery or security in terms of expert skill among those who concentrate heavily. Let us now consider the latter group briefly:

We have instances of girls whose insistence on concentrating as heavily as possible in one area seems to be related to authority attitudes (resistance to teachers' suggestions to broaden out) and also to an antagonism or hostility to certain kinds of problems and experience which is also related to other expressions of antagonism (to people generally, for instance). Other students have great insecurity against which achievement in one field becomes an important defense. Still others are more or less frankly afraid to try other fields that seem potentially disturbing to them. On the other hand, with some girls, although some insecurity may be present, it is not at all apparent on the surface; the factor of specialization is directed chiefly toward professional preparation.

Whatever the motivation for extreme specialization, the faculty may find it important to ask: Does the student's ability justify her effort to become expert in this field? Is this concentration giving her the personal development she needs? A number of seniors commented on their experience with specialized programs; frequently they regretted overspecialization. One student remarked "I always had a hard time finding a third course, and the only one that really meant anything was a course in which the teacher emphasized indi-

vidual work heavily and let me tie up my project work with my major interest." Several students said they wished they had "branched out more," that faculty and advisers *had* suggested other subjects, but at the time they hadn't wanted them and they were sorry now. "Perhaps I should have been *made* to try it" was not an infrequent comment. The student with the most concentrated program complained of going completely "stale" her senior year. Other students clearly stated that they were not at all certain at the end that the solid achievement and skills acquired as a result of a highly concentrated program were worth the price. "My education has been rather narrow"; "I would like to be free"; "What I should have done freshman year was to try out a great many things instead of just sticking to things that I knew I wanted"; "I would have been better off with a little *less* 'foundation.'"

It is important here that of all the students interviewed one with a narrowly concentrated program in science was most vague about her future plans, most unassertive and passive in her attitudes. It almost looks as if her search for "something definite" were in response to her own lack of assurance (this is in direct contrast to aggressive, incisive students who chose less "definite" subjects like dramatics and social philosophy). It is also interesting that this student was more than usually relieved at the "freedom" of college and commented, "I don't think I would get along at a camp. The idea of a gong going off at seven and everybody hopping out of bed at the same time . . . it was awful." "Definiteness" evidently has strong and specific meanings for a girl like this, in which need for and rebellion against it are intermingled.

A glimpse of possibilities of personal and emotional development not realized was reflected by another student with an overspecialized program who felt that her difficulties with people were due to the fact that she was "too formal." This gives one clue to some of the reasons for the narrow programs; both the "formality" and the narrowness are rooted in a need for security in terms of clear patterns of achievement.

Yet, at the end, when the need for achievement is satisfied, students sometimes feel that they have sold their souls for a mess of pottage; they would give anything to have had help toward reaching a more genuine release, greater freedom with people.

We are not saying that working for achievement values is necessarily a mistake. As we have seen, a sizable collection of students found release and freedom precisely *after* achievement had given them a base of security. The point is simply that achievement alone is often not enough.

A related problem also common to colleges where a system of majors is in force is that of conflicting interests. Students of drive and varied talents have never found it easy to decide in favor of one interest as against others. The increasing competitiveness of the economic world probably works toward forcing a choice earlier than would otherwise be necessary. At any rate, among students with conflicting interests we find the conflict arbitrarily solved by the necessity of earning a living, while students who are not under this necessity may go on after college caught in a conflict from which they cannot extricate themselves. Here as at other points we have occasion to reflect on the limited value of "freedom" for certain individuals, as against the sometimes emancipating coercions of reality—whether the reality of prescribed courses, examinations, marks, or the need to earn a living.

Implications for Guidance

When difficulties in an area of work arise from the tension or anxiety focused upon it, successful efforts at adjustment may have one of these results: conquering the trouble may afford great relief and release from the attendant anxiety; or, when the focal point of strain is a symptom of deeper trouble, a new symptom may be substituted for the one which has been successfully treated. Often these local or special difficulties are the result of deficiencies in previous education and

the student is greatly relieved by help in overcoming them. Sometimes these special difficulties are supported by deeper fears or resistances which have to be dealt with before the work habits can be modified.

PATTERNS OF PERSONALITY

IT IS APPARENT that the interest in the student at work shifted from the initial concern with how her background affected her work, and from the topics to which she responded and her approach to them, to an interest in the question, What characteristics of approach and behavior interfere with growth? We have also seen that the individual differences at first paralleled the differences in security, response to authority, and rigidity. Clearly, an organization of the teachers' observations of such personality characteristics as these might well lead to a keener understanding of what makes for development in the student at college.

As a preliminary, it seemed desirable to review in detail the complete four-year record of all students in a class and to get from this review an over-all estimate of the importance and frequency of typical patterns of personality affecting student development. These reports are primarily concerned with the quality and nature of the student's work, and the characteristics of her approach or of her personality that contribute to or interfere with "good work." On first inspection, the individual variations seem as numerous as the patterns of butterfly wings; but shortly they collect themselves into a limited number of groups.

Students Who Develop Steadily

Approximately a quarter of the freshman class fits into the faculty expectation of competent, independent, insightful workers who have sufficient initiative and imagination to carry on independent study, sufficient grasp to meet teacher demands for depth, and sufficient steadiness to do consistent thorough work. Each year a few of these students exhibit amazing ability to transcend serious hazards and shocks that would be expected to hurt almost anyone.

Another fourth of the class do good work but present mild

disappointments. This group, like the first quarter, is predominantly, though by no means exclusively, from the upper half of the group on the American Council Test. They are able to handle normal problems with parents, boy and girl friends, and teachers without casualties to their work. The reports describe them in such terms as "penetrating," "thoughtful," "systematic," "imaginative," "stimulating," "avid," the "backbone of the college," "brilliant," "responsible"; they "think independently, show curiosity and a capacity for analysis." Here are girls whose initial work gives promise of brilliance, but, although they are rated average to good or even excellent on their reports, they do not achieve the consistent level of brilliance for which the faculty hoped. Here also are those who do very well in certain areas, but make their teachers and advisers uncomfortable by their tendency to excessive specialization. Here are those who seem slow at times, but in the long run show a gratifying steady development. Another handful of students must be grouped with these: girls whose work by objective standards is perfectly adequate but who also make their teachers uncomfortable because it seems to matter so little to them. Their faculty complain of a "lack of drive" or extreme casualness of attitude even though work turned in is good.

The specialists include girls like Celia, who seem to be capable of well-rounded interests but for one reason or another choose to put all their eggs into one basket; or girls who, like Penelope, are obviously haunted by a painful degree of anxiety but manage to "come through" in one field such as creative writing; or girls who, like Pauline, do not have a very firm grip on life until they happily discover a God-given talent big enough to justify a concentrated focus.

The girls who lack "drive" but nevertheless do acceptable work include some passive girls like Camilla. They have simply not been brought up to take themselves seriously enough as citizens to try to develop their capacities as fully as possible. They are perfectly comfortable as they are and doubt-

less often much happier than their tensely ambitious sisters. But, unfortunately, this group also includes some whose lack of drive is less complacent—girls like Edith and Theo, whose appearance of casualness masks a deep disappointment with themselves and a fear of daring to have or try out an idea or of caring to take themselves seriously. These girls have something in common with the group of gifted students who have been so frequently and deeply frustrated that they seem unable to formulate goals or take themselves seriously enough to exert real effort to reach a goal. In the achievement and work field this is analogous to the attitude of the girl who does not expect to be married; she has been so often hurt in her love relationships that she does not want to give herself a chance to be hurt and frustrated again. The paradoxical thing is that these girls do good work; but it is never exciting to them. Their teachers can scarcely complain, but they are often wistful, wishing that these good minds could find really exhilarating enjoyment.

Students That Teachers Worry About

Against this, roughly, 50 percent who go through college causing relatively little or no fuss on the part of their teachers or the Student Work Committee is the other 50 percent responsible for endless meetings with the Student Work Committee, telephone calls, and luncheon meetings with dons. There are those who at first appear hostile and antagonistic to their teachers or the college authorities in general, and also those who are too dependent on authority, always wanting excessively detailed directions and perhaps even a demand for textbook authorities. Sometimes related to these are the compulsive, rigid, or perfectionistic students described by Munroe.¹

Students whose work habits and interests are too scattered to result in sustained development; those who work fairly well but spasmodically; those whose work appears on time

¹ R. L. Munroe, *Teaching the Individual* (New York, 1942),

but is always deck-level, never rising above a superficial degree of insight or analysis; and the immature, shy or naïve ones—these form other common patterns in the group who occasion faculty worry. Along with them are a few girls so prejudiced or so egocentrically limited in the areas of their response that many educational doors are closed to them; and a few excessively lazy students, excessively practical or insincere students.

All of these are, of course, girls whose emotional rapport with teachers or with methods or material of work is sufficiently disturbed to affect their adequacy to a more or less serious degree. Munroe² presented in detail two types of student among those who cause the faculty concern; the scattered and the rigid students. For this reason I need not discuss them in detail here, beyond calling attention to the fact that these are not, of course, neatly defined groups, but that problems often overlap; this is especially true among the groups described chiefly as superficial, spasmodic, and scattered. However, it can even happen that a rigid student who loses her excessive control may become scattered, so that we see that the rigidity was at least partly a result of the compensatory effort to control impulses which might lead to scatter. It may also be worth while to point out that responses at different levels are not necessarily consistent. A student may be very inhibited in social situations and very imaginative in work situations; very scattered in "practical" matters and clearheaded about academic problems, tense in psychomotor expression but full of strong emotional response. When we speak of "scattered" and "rigid" we are referring almost solely to the character of a student's work, as displayed in the varied situations of class discussion, conference, written reports, field trips. These general characteristics are doubtless responsible in part for the difficulties in planning programs discussed in the previous section.

The group of spasmodic workers overlaps in part the "scat-

² *Ibid.*

tered" group. Nevertheless there are certain distinguishing features among them: certain spasmodic girls achieve a respectable record in the end, despite irregular work tempo; others never "carry through," never organize their intuitive flashes or achieve any real integration in their work. It is with the first group that we are concerned now, and even here we find a variety of patterns. Hannah, Penelope, and possibly Sylvia belong to a group of sensitive, creative girls whose work, when it appears, may be described as "beautiful," "talented," "delicate," "imaginative." The same intuitive quality that was considered an asset in creative work was referred to, in natural and social sciences, as "jumping to conclusions" and "lack of analysis." This reliance upon intuition for productivity may be connected in Hannah's case with the "peaks and valleys" of output, the uneven achievement reported in all courses. Penelope also used creative and imaginative resources in writing and literature and succeeded less well with work requiring analysis (in this case, music), and was also criticized for irregular achievement. Similar insight and quick perception were characteristic of Beth, whose instructor optimistically referred to her peaks and valleys as periods of hibernation followed by blossoming. But other instructors exhibited less readiness to consider these an integral part of the creative process, and complained of fragmentary work and uneven effort. We might be inclined to press the importance of the periods of hibernation for these spasmodically creative girls if it were not for the painful conflicts apparent in all their records. In two instances the conflict grew out of great strain in the home situation; in another it obviously arose within the girl herself, who despite great gifts in creative writing made a complete shift to natural science and gave up all creative work in college.

This little group of sensitive, perceptive girls whose work is maintained at a variable level disappointing to their teachers is very different from the exhilarated, effervescent, spirited girls who comprise the remainder of the "spasmodic" group.

"Enormous vitality," "verve," "headstrong energy" are characteristic of this group, of whom Louise is one example. The "ups and downs," "slumps and recoveries" are even more dramatic here than in the first group, but the reasons may not be so different; as we shall see, Louise's restlessness was also related to conflicts regarding her father's desires and expectations for her and his opinion of her.

"Superficial" students are also a discouraging group. To be sure these girls are predominantly in the lower half of the American Council Examination. So it would not be surprising to find some of them "superficial" because of limited abilities that make higher mental processes—higher, that is, than fact learning and rule following—really difficult for them. But there are also enough girls in the top 50 percent of the A.C.E. who are considered superficial in their work to justify looking at the group as a whole more carefully.

Superficiality is described in some cases as clinging to the making of forms largely external in character and divorced from human content or meaning (Hortense and Rhoda R.). This has been observed in several girls whose manual skill and visual imagination give an unusual basis for superior achievement in the creation of artistic forms, but whose social relationships involve a larger element of hostility or rejection at some, not necessarily all, points. Rhoda R. could not face the extreme domination of her parents, she could only escape from it through a preoccupation with form; Hortense found in formal achievement an avenue to the superiority and distinction which she craved.

Outside the art field, essentially the same pattern appears in the girls who derive from a novel only the structure of the plot and miss entirely the quality of the writing, the motivation of the characters, the author's purpose. The pattern also appears in the girl who, dealing with psychological problems, produces a tidy outline without perception or understanding. This was true of Caroline as a freshman; as might be expected, in her second year she remembered almost noth-

ing of all the work so industriously organized into systematic outlines—it had never become a part of her.

Other “superficial” students are described in varying terms:

Polly’s superficiality is rooted in a “good girl” amiability which prevents her from getting deeply into anything she does.

Stella and Audrie are superficial through an aggressive, ambitious pressure to achieve in quantitative terms which sacrificed depth, solidity, insight. Vera likewise seemed chiefly “anxious to make a good impression” but was perfunctory and not very “real” in her interests.

Agnes and Bridget were superficial in a careless, glib, easy-going or lethargic way. Like them, Phyllis seemed to do superficial work through lack of effort. Selina and Jasmine both seemed nonchalant, casual, lazy, not doing sustained work.

Lena seemed unable to make decisions of her own, or to carry through her work to a deep level because of conflicts between trying to meet college standards and trying to please her parents.

Only one of these students remained in college for an A.B., since in accordance with Sarah Lawrence standards a student whose work is “superficial” is not encouraged to continue—regardless of the factual standards or quantitative achievement shown—unless she develops a capacity for deeper and more solidly understanding work.

Sometimes, as with Olive, the central point seems to be a thorough practicality which is the touchstone for all intellectual values, and which limits the depth of probing. In still another instance a student may willingly amass facts but is satisfied with a superficial digestion of them and is unconcerned with their implications or meanings. A frequent criticism of freshmen, this often disappears by the second or third year in girls who are genuinely eager for the understanding offered at college. Freshman difficulty is sometimes due to the unfamiliarity of the new facts and the need for an assimilation period before relationships and meanings can be spontaneously seen. This period of assimilation may be prolonged because one girl needs more time than another to get oriented,

or because she is preoccupied with social adjustments the first year and is too distracted by them to assimilate her work.

But some girls do not show a deeper grasp of their work as time goes on. They cling persistently to the descriptive level of work until finally the faculty are forced to conclude that they are really afraid of the implications of facts and are unconsciously resisting the efforts to help them see connections and interrelations. This may happen when the implications challenge beliefs that form a framework of values upon which the student is deeply dependent; or when they throw an unfavorable light on the behavior of people close to her, which she could not bear.

Superficiality in some cases results from the lack of real intellectual interest. Such a girl was Vera, who had an A.C.T. rating at the 90th percentile but who frankly didn't think that field trips to learn about the conditions produced by unemployment were socially safe. "I wouldn't want to do anything that might take my name out of the Social Register." Her work was careful, even thorough, on the surface, but as one might expect under these conditions, was done with a perfunctory air of meeting required demands. The charge of superficiality, then, has more varied meanings for the faculty than any other of their complaints about these students. In the next chapter it will be of interest to see what becomes of this group, how many of them showed signs of growth in comparison with the other groups we have been discussing.

A common conception of Sarah Lawrence, which misinterprets the "development of your own interests," probably made this college particularly accessible to a certain type of egocentric student, of whom the faculty complain that everything she works on has to have some personal meaning; everything she reads is judged from her own provincial or family-directed frame of reference. Other people's problems or ideas are none of her affair; she cares little for history and the objective social sciences, and she takes psychology chiefly for the opportunity to work on her own

problems. Very often girls of this type are superficially maladjusted—not so seriously unadjusted, to be sure, as those who require immediate psychiatric help or others who build enormous defenses against their problems and refuse to look at them, but maladjusted enough to be preoccupied with their own troubles and prejudices and unfree for outward-looking curiosities or the consideration of social and scientific problems of general concern to intelligent citizens.

Implications for Guidance

This chapter is intimately related to the two chapters which follow. All three are concerned with students whose difficulties are not primarily external to themselves and are not focused in one limited area of work; on the contrary, their problems in college stem from their own characters, and represent pervasive attitudes reflected often in all their work and even in life outside of college. It should not be assumed that because these patterns are pervasive they are more difficult to handle from a guidance point of view; the difficulty of solution varies with the depth of the pattern and the intensity of the emotional needs which support it rather than with its pervasiveness. It may be assumed, however, that an attack on the pervasive problem itself rather than upon its expression in one area or another is often needed; such an approach may have to come from the college psychiatrist or a teacher with suitable training. If a teacher in one area finds it profitable to attack the problem in that area it is important to consider with the student its appearance in other areas.

INSECURITY AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL

TEACHERS report insecurity in a large number of students, the nuances and sources of whose attitudes vary enormously. We have already noted the temporary insecurity characteristic of many students to whom the standards and values of the college are new. This temporary situational insecurity is not a permanent cause for concern when it is overcome by adjustment to the new situation. The students described in the following summary are not from this group but were observed by several if not all of their teachers to be insecure through the whole year, or in some cases throughout their college course.

Ida, Lina, Doris B. and Viola were shy in the social situations of conference and class, but in written work were not at all inhibited in their dealings with materials and ideas. In these cases there was probably no real intellectual insecurity—the shyness stemmed from the fact that at Sarah Lawrence intellectual work is frequently set in a social context; that is, in group discussions and conferences with the instructor. Some of these shy girls have a particularly rich inner and intellectual life, perhaps partly because their lack of social activity gives them more time for it. A girl like Hope, on the other hand, may have a deep inferiority feeling that interferes with intellectual work although her relationships with young people are not much affected.

Marian was not at all shy in purely social situations; indeed, she was quite popular with other girls and her background gave her a very firm security in social relationships with different kinds of girls. But against her intellectual background she felt inferior—she could not compete with “the geniuses who were most of her relatives.” So she seemed at first incapable of good intellectual work, until as she measured herself not against her family of geniuses but in relation to

other girls she discovered her real ability and grew free to use and enjoy it.

Another group includes those who are shy in a much deeper sense; their relation to the objective world is so burdened with fear and inhibitions that not merely the social process of discussion but actual experience and thinking are blocked. The sense of inadequacy may affect certain types of skill, not others. Judith was inhibited at first about theoretical work because her family had thought of her as the artist and of her sister as the intellectual; actually Judith herself was very responsive to intellectual work and successful in it, once she had got beyond her initial hurdles carried over from a sibling-rivalry situation. A girl like Delia B., whose shyness is largely social in origin because her background is socially inferior to that of other girls, may be inhibited both socially and intellectually at first, then grow more secure on both fronts at the same time. In her case, intellectual security developed first, out of her teachers' emphasis on the important cultural contributions of her background; from this footing in intellectual pride grew more confidence in social situations.

The Merrill-Palmer study of college women after graduation¹ discloses the frequency with which this group felt insecure, inadequate, or fearful about the various tasks of adjustment confronting adult women. To be sure, the sample was probably weighted somewhat in the direction of this insecure group, since it might be expected that those with the greater difficulties would be the more eager for the counseling service offered in connection with the study. Even so, the results suggest the desirability of evaluating the extent to which insecurity hampers effective dealing with problems at the college level.

According to the results of both the Bernreuter and the Maslow tests, the Sarah Lawrence students tend to be "dom-

¹ Robert G. Foster and Pauline P. Wilson, *Women After College* (New York, 1942).

inant," to have more self-confidence than the general run of college girls—or at least those on whom the tests are standardized. This is what we should expect if economic security and "social advantages" contribute to self-confidence. In view of the fact that among the roughly 50 percent of girls who do not proceed through college in a steady, competent, adjusted fashion, there is a large proportion of "shy," "insecure," "anxious," "inhibited" girls, we may well inquire what this over-all superiority in self-confidence and adjustment actually means. If it is true that Sarah Lawrence girls are more self-confident than others, the problem of insecurity must be even more acute for girls of other groups. An alternative would be that while these Sarah Lawrence students are more secure and self-confident "socially," they are less secure intellectually or in relation to the practical problems of adjustment. Or we might even consider the possibility that while they are self-confident and "dominant" in the sense of being easily able to handle the amenities and superficial problems of "getting around," they still are insecure about popularity in their own group, about having enough dates and the like.

Out of the thirty intensive case studies prepared for the Study of Adolescents under the direction of Caroline Zachry, there are individual instances of every focus of insecurity. Lucille was anxious and worried lest her long list of social engagements might not continue at the established rate. Anne was insecure about whether boys and girls liked her. Diane was a gifted student whose lack of confidence appeared to stem from her exaggerated standards and "false notions about art, culture and genius." With another student unsureness seemed to be noted in the gap between her unusual sensitivity to details of emotion, personality, qualities of writing, and her difficulty in grasping abstract ideas and broad patterns. Further inspection of records brings instances such as these: Gladys and Judy ascribe their insecurity to a previous school failure; Delia appears to be conscious of a

Some insecure girls show no development of any sort. If exposed to some of the more tough-minded approaches by teachers who want to waste no time in attacking "smugness," "colorlessness," in "getting beneath the surface," "cracking them open," or "opening the students' eyes," they may resist by a firm clinging to family values as a defense against the sense of inadequacy created by an aggressive educational approach. This resistance then becomes a deep lack of open mindedness which is further criticized by faculty, who conclude that the student "does not want to learn." Increased colorlessness may be another defense when the insecure student tries to avoid taking risks in talk, manner, clothes, or classwork; she "fits in" as thoroughly as possible, though her teachers and perhaps her classmates would prefer an open fight to empty compliance.

A related sort of conflict with previous standards arises when a girl has changed from very conservative methods of training to more "modern" or "progressive" methods in coming to college. Thus Q., who according to all her records was a serious student at high school, became evasive and did not concentrate when confronted by the new methods at college.

Where progress does occur there is frequently an acknowledgment to the "encouragement" of a "kind" teacher's interest. Over and over again notes on these girls report them to be "easily discouraged," "affected by failure"; they become depressed, are easily frustrated, disappointed. They need reassurance even more consistently than the normally shy freshman, and when they are "understood" and helped to gain security in successive areas they do "overcome" their shyness.

Individual instances of this sort do not give us an adequate view of a class as a whole or the extent to which it is sound to think of college girls like those at Sarah Lawrence—a little above average intellectually, much above average in cultural information and social experience—as shadowed by fear at

one of its various levels. One way to check this is to return to our review of the class as a whole. Since insecurity may be fought, disguised, compensated for, or pocketed off in numerous ways, no superficial check can be offered as complete; the review of instructor's comments in reports is more likely to understate than to overstate the case, because the nonpsychiatrically trained teacher would in general be likely to record the more obvious rather than the more disguised expressions of insecurity, fear, or anxiety.

If we include all the students noted by teachers as shy, anxious, worried, insecure, inadequate, afraid to explore new areas, or having an unusual number of fears, we have a group of 27 from a class of 113. These were distributed exactly equally between the top and bottom half of the American Council Examination. Of the 27 insecure students, 5, or approximately 19 percent, completed the A.B. degree; for the class as a whole, this compares with 30 out of 113, or approximately 26 percent—a difference that is probably not to be taken very seriously.

Certain instances in this group may give us a clue to the way in which some of these shy or anxious girls handle their problems. Mabel was an object of special interest and respect, an "unforgettable person because she tried so hard to become a real person"; Phoebe developed special gifts in art which led to striking over-all development; and others showed a marked tendency to exert great effort to overcome their general anxiety.

We have given special attention to problems of these students partly because they are obvious, partly because the more general problem of fear or anxiety in students may be most easily approached via this open road. As we have seen, overt fear and hostility by no means lead to failure; indeed, the contrary is often true. Doubtless because the franker expression of feelings gives faculty something to work with, these groups generally come through.

More difficult to handle may be the groups in which fear is

not open or thinly disguised but is cleverly masked. The mask may be a façade which prevents any genuine contact between the student and her work; or a clinging to superficial approaches which successfully avoid the confusion that deeper thinking and feeling would entail; a giving up of active demands, initiation or purposes, defended by a perpetual play-possum or don't-care attitude; or a jack-rabbit leaping from hither to yon. The relation of all these may be schematized as follows. In a simple fear situation like that confronted by any animal in the woods we may:

- run away;
- lie still;
- adopt a disguise;
- put the pursuer off the scent;
- fight the attacker;
- grow panicky and disorganized, doing nothing effective;
- become paralyzed and immobile.

These elemental reactions to fear are easily paralleled in the escapes, passivities, disguises, resistances, ineffectual disorganization, or in inhibition in discussion, and conference, thinking or feeling. All these are shown by groups of students labeled by teachers as "superficial," "lacking drive," "covered with a mask," "resistant," "scattered," "inhibited."

It would be an oversimplification to suggest that fear is the only important factor in disorganized work habits, in lack of energy or interests, or in superficial contacts with people and work. But where inadequate ability, poor training, health, or lack of opportunity can be eliminated, the next consideration is the likelihood of anxiety as a major underlying problem.

Implications for Guidance

We have seen that these insecure and anxious students were no more or less successful than the rest of the students in their class, judged by the proportion who completed the A.B. degree. Being insecure is not as dangerous to intellectual work as being rigid or superficial, for instance. Our con-

cern with these students is with their happiness and comfort rather than their achievement, which may actually be stimulated by their insecurity. As wives, mothers, workers, citizens they need security, if we can judge from the reports of subjects in the Merrill-Palmer study.

Often the curriculum can be directly therapeutic. A sense of social or class inferiority may be relieved by a larger social viewpoint; feelings of inferiority arising from competition with siblings may yield to a more objective assessment of one's own assets and liabilities; achievement in one area may yield security and confidence to broaden into other areas; understanding of the ways in which insecurity arises may reduce its effects.

Teachers of all generations have understood the balm of appreciation, recognition, faith in a student, which, when genuinely felt both in the giving and the receiving, can implant feelings of security that will grow.

AUTHORITY PROBLEMS IN RELATION TO LEARNING

SARAH LAWRENCE teachers, like teachers of children and young people at all age levels, are particularly concerned about hostile or resistant students and those who seem especially dependent. Of the hostile and resistant group many turn out well, at least in their own terms. (This applies chiefly to the openly hostile students who make their objections clear and thus give their advisers something to work on; girls whose hostility is strongly repressed or masked present a different and much more difficult problem.) They are likely to specialize, as did Theresa, Berta, Dora, and Hermine, and to end up with unusual strength in the field of their specialty. Dynamically, one might suggest that this happens when girls of a high energy level are frustrated either before entrance to college or early in the freshman stage and then find release in being allowed to follow choices about which they feel strongly. This offers no surprise to a clinician; it is the old story, perhaps, of the aggressive delinquent, whose protests are easily expressed in destructive ways but whose energy is just as easily turned into leadership in the Boys' Club, if a Boys' Club can be provided. This precise thing happens at college. Hermine staged a violent temper tantrum her first day of registration in my office; she was certain that she would be "made" to take courses she did not want to take. In her senior year, as president of the Chorus and a distinguished member of the college, she laughed with me at the recollection.

Dependence

In its earlier period, Sarah Lawrence was for a long time particularly opaque in its view of dependent students. Teachers complained about it, instead of directly meeting the

needs of those who craved specific directions, wanted textbooks—or at least the privilege of quoting *some* respectable book authority—or the security of working with a definite pattern or structure. Rebellious, antagonistic girls were both easier to understand and easier to handle than these docile ones who wanted to be taught step by step or “spoon-fed.” Perhaps this is why we found that the records of the dependent group showed less happy development than most of the other groups we have been discussing. Dramatic results simply do not appear in their records.

Erich Fromm, in a series of seminars devoted to the discussion and understanding of the student's relation to the authority of the teacher as a factor in the learning process, outlined the following attitudes as important:

- dependence on authority;
- rebellion or defiance against authority;
- identification with authority;
- objective coöperation with authority;
- ignoring authority.

As we have seen, teachers at Sarah Lawrence have in general recognized as fitting into these classifications students who are excessively dependent on the teacher's authority and those who are more or less openly antagonistic to it. Those who identify with a teacher's authority are apt to take on the intellectual values of the college and, if they have good ability, they do such satisfying work that no one questions the motivation for it unless the identification is reflected in unusual behavior, as in this instance:

At the beginning of the year Sandra showed a tendency to identify with the teacher, picking up the teacher's vocabulary, exchanging little jokes, etc. She was competitive in a very aggressive, though indirect way, with other students, always leaping to the opportunity to suggest a more original idea. In conference, too, where some students would be deferential, she put herself on a level with the faculty, used an offhand, familiar manner signing Smith instead of Miss Smith on her registration slips, referring to faculty by their first names. She constantly reached toward adult

problems and ideas in her course work, and was more observant, critical, realistic than some girls, although at the same time she had much more difficulty in organizing her work than had other members of the class. Her methods of work seemed childish while her concepts seemed adult.

This identification with adults in the educational setting was in great contrast with Sandra's attitude toward home adults. Explosive, violent expression of antagonism to parents in general was frequent and finally culminated in a special project on parent-child relations.

Among the dependent group are those who must have a green light before they can move at all; those who "want to be told" and come to conference asking for specific directions; those who passively follow all cues from a teacher, trying to please the teacher at the expense of working out ideas of their own; and those who are so rigidly tied to the home authorities that they cannot respond to the new authorities of college. In the first group of instances the student's work is not wholly satisfactory because none of it ever seems to come from herself; she has no ideas of her own. Her teachers wish she would go to a college where taking notes on lectures and passing true-false tests are the backbone of the work, since her presence would obviously raise fewer questions in the minds of her faculty there. This, of course, is not the case with students whose dependence is focused on home authority and is not generalized to authority at large.

The home-authority girl may be orderly and conscientious but she may appear defiant at first: she "resents new ideas," or ideas that conflict with her own home-knit pattern. This initial defiance and resentment breaks down, however, when she gradually makes a transition from rigid adherence to the home pattern and transfers her allegiance to the patterns of college. She then appears as the really dependent-on-authority person that she is. This shift to a new pattern is a step toward freedom, and as in the case of Grace can be used by her teachers as a stepping-stone toward more receptive consideration of different points of view and emancipation

from preconceived notions. This, of course, does not happen all at once; Grace made real progress in this direction in literature but the following year the process had to start all over again in economics, when she again showed resistance "to ideas not associated with her own set of values."

Dependence on authority may take more generalized forms, as in the case of students who need *some* sort of definite pattern or structure before they can move freely in dealing with new material. These students may want to know who is "right," what is the "best book," what is the "real answer"; they are ill at ease when forced to compare conflicting points of view, to analyze or decide for themselves. Since this process of analysis, criticism, and independent thinking is the core of many courses at Sarah Lawrence, as at many other liberal arts colleges, this deep need for "right answers" again creates difficulties for the teachers. The following three summaries illustrate variations of these attitudes of dependence:

Belinda accepted the teacher as teacher. "All her instructors observed her responsible attitude in class; she is always attentive, is frequently first to take notes, volunteers her own contributions to discussion. . . . She seldom uses the class for personal purposes, but has a business-like attitude as if assuming that listening to the instructor rather than discussion with students is the purpose of class meeting. At the beginning of the year she frequently had an appealing manner as if to say: 'I always do what is right. I hope you know what a conscientious lovable girl I am.' She also accepts the authority of books. Her attitude toward her family seems idealized and unreal; she is not able to make the detached analysis of her relation to them that many freshmen find helpful in attempting to reach an understanding independence. She seems bound by her family in a way that makes it necessary for her to consider them perfect, and herself their perfect child. At college she likewise becomes the perfect student for perfect teachers. This positive response to teachers provided an initial warm contact which could be used to help her understand her need for more independence."

Rosalind is like Belinda in some ways. She shares the picture of perfect daughter, of a perfect family, but in her case the identification goes so deep that it prevents rather than facilitates an

identification or responsive relation to adults in the first months of college. She is dignified, coöperative in discussion and articulate except when topics are broached in which the class point of view differs from that of her family. In such cases she is equally remote from students and teacher and maintains her alliance strictly with the family. This pattern, of course, makes it hard for teachers to help her.

Emily made a systematic attempt to put her adviser completely *in loco parentis*, discussing every intimate detail, asking advice on every issue that came up and working through her plan of life with a consistent substitution of adviser for parents during her time in college. Again in this instance, her wish for direction could be used to guide her toward greater independence.

Stimulated by some of the faculty discussions on the subject, a member of the faculty offered an hypothesis regarding the basis of a common pattern of response to authority. We shall present this, with slight modification, in the following paragraphs.

One of the most striking things in certain freshman records is the way in which the thinking of some students is bound up with an authoritative figure, usually masculine. The teacher's effort to get the girl to draw conclusions from facts strikes a barrier in the shape of a previous allegiance to the opinions of someone important to her, usually her father. Her allegiance is sometimes to an institution, such as the church, or to the climate of opinion in which she has grown up. However, with certain students almost any *man* is an adequate authority. The reports on Ernestine, for instance, show this tendency to take the opinion of a male figure (*any* male, one suspects, barring conflicts) as final. She quotes a male instructor (apparently in a thoroughly garbled version) on the futility of relief and city-planning projects, evidently with the intention of refuting what she considers to be the opinion of another teacher. Somewhat later she cites authority twice over in the same class session on the subject of the diet of Italian families on relief, "Garlic is very good for you. Out Italian gardener always said so." Of this same student an-

other teacher reports a completely indiscriminating attribution of authority to the printed word. "One remarkable fact about the paper was that every statement of opinion in it came directly from material that she had read and not from her own thinking. Consequently she would place the most contradictory statements side by side without apparently seeing the inconsistency."

One teacher quotes a conversation with a student who found herself in conflict between two male authorities. "She stated that she was very confused. She carried my opinions to her father and he reduced them to absurdity; at the same time I was able to show her difficulties and inconsistencies with her father. I suggested that she might try to form her own opinions and think for herself rather than rely on her most recent meeting with me or her father for her ideas." Later in the year this student undertook to write a paper on Wilson. Her teacher considered this a significant attempt to break away from the authority of her father. In conferences she indicated an opinion opposite to her father's, but the paper proved ambiguous.

The account of Myra amounts to a parody of this situation; here, apparently, the opinions the student expresses count for nothing, the relationship with the instructor for everything. She waits with a "watchfully cat-like" expression till she has guessed the probable attitude of the instructor on any question, then gives it back to him as accurately as possible. "I have a number of times deliberately given her the wrong lead," he says, "and watched her commit herself to what she realized a second or two later was an absurdity; but this low trick has been progressively less successful as she has become better acquainted with my prejudices and characteristic ways of reacting." On one occasion Myra "had talked to a student about *The Magic Mountain*, and was interestingly double-barreled with regard to an apparent contradiction between what I had said about the book and what the other student had quoted her teacher as saying. (They were both

wrong.) She seemed to want at the same time to show me that I had made a mistake, and that I was probably right nevertheless."

Theoretically, there is no reason why students should not respond with equal readiness to the opinions of women instructors—accepting them or finding them in conflict with some previous allegiance—and unquestionably they do, but the instances in which the opinion is confused with the person appear to be much more striking in the case of men teachers. Opinion apparently speaks to such girls with masculine face and voice, even when women appear on the faculty in quasi-masculine authoritative roles. "I have such an admiration for my don," says Harriet. "I always listen to everything he says as if he were God. Everybody laughs at me, because I'm always quoting him: 'My don says this wouldn't be good for me.' I think he's simply wonderful." It would be valuable to have analogous records of undergraduate boys.

Of the small number of girls whose thinking appears relatively free from authoritarian influence, girls not necessarily good thinkers but reasonably independent ones, some seem to have attained this capacity at the cost of identifying to some extent with a masculine role as defined in our culture. Some of these girls show either marked repression of feeling and instinct or an aggressive mode of expression that sometimes involves enormous frankness on taboo subjects and (in one case) a habitual, passionate expression of feeling that is singularly unconvincing to the observer. Sometimes the girl's appearance itself is slightly masculine. Sometimes her assumption of authority annoys her fellow students.

A report on Bernice describes her aggressiveness and tendency to dominate the class, her superior ability, "egalitarian" attitude toward the instructor, and her great ambition.

Her slow, seemingly overdeliberate delivery and evident "wisdom" tend to antagonize her classmates. She is quite slow on the rebound and partly deliberately so because of her great need to carefully weigh the question from every possible angle, in terms

of all her past reading and experience in the matter. However, Bernice is not much disturbed evidently by these reactions of her classmates, and is quite able and willing to dominate them and even "over-rule" them in the course of the discussion.

She gives the instructor an "autobiographic clue" in her description of a character in Mae Sinclair's novel *The Belfry*; in her words, the character "had ambition, set for himself definite goals, difficult goals and bombarded his way through unscalable walls to reach them."

Records of other students, however, indicate an ability for independent thinking without any such untoward result. One hesitates to assume that in all of these other cases there has been no identification with a masculine role or with the father; it may simply be less obvious than in the preceding groups, or it may exist but not come out in the record. There is also the possibility that a student may show striking independence in one field of thought but not in another, for instance, a student may appear able to "think" in the impersonal context of a natural science course but less able to do so in the social sciences where personal identifications may be involved.

A record of Lavinia suggests an almost ideal development: "She is able to argue without rousing antagonism against herself. . . . She rarely takes part unless there are new questions being raised in her mind. She is the rare student who always seems to be recreating herself as new data and point of view are presented."

Finally there is the account of Charlotte, who, while she is described as not primarily a thinker, appears to do what thinking she does quite independently. She is tremendously aggressive and dominates any class she is in, making life difficult for the instructor and greatly antagonizing other students. She combines great frankness and freedom in ideas, expression, and behavior with (one suspects, at least) repression of her deepest feelings. She overacts the emotion of the moment, whatever it may be, to the point of embarrassing

the other students. "When the papers were sad, Charlotte wept—dripped actual tears all over the table and into the ash-trays; when they were funny, or somebody cracked a joke, Charlotte bellowed and roared." At the same time, I personally found this girl's autobiography as genuinely moving as anything in the records; she possesses such acute consciousness of her own experience and such unusual power to convey it that she commands the involuntary respect of the reader. It seems to me that her teacher's commentary on this student raises a significant educational question: "Her difficulty is bred less of specific trauma or guilt than of prolonged frustration and hunger for love."

It is probably fair to say that the relations which a student builds with her teachers and adviser reflect in varied ways the pattern of her previous relations with adults, both parents and teachers; she may transfer love and dependence from her parents to a new adult; she may transfer to a new teacher her dependence upon old teachers; she may project her rebellion against parents to new adults; she may use rapport with new adults as a way of freeing herself and of sustaining her rebellion against old ones.

For many students, the mother, rather than the father, is the important authority. Sometimes, as with Virgilia, the student feels so coerced and tightly bound that all her emotions are concentrated in resentment against her mother's domination. This resentment may be transferred to any women faculty who appear to be arbitrary or dominating. Conversely a sympathetic and permissive woman teacher is accepted as a "good mother." Identification with a mother's social-class values may, as with Caroline, prevent her daughter from showing a receptive and understanding approach to problems of groups outside their own. Sometimes the mother's social-class pattern may be used as a crutch to support the insecure daughter uncertain of her creative or intellectual possibilities. A girl may be so generally dependent upon a mother-authority that she chooses predominantly women

teachers and expects detailed directions from them, which the teachers, hopeful for the emergence of independence, are loath to give. Other girls, like Anne and possibly Charlotte, feel permanently deprived because of an earlier trauma from the death, illness, or lack of love from a mother, and continue to seek from a woman teacher affection and support—warmth which may be a ticket for good work from the student. (Anne said hotly, “I can’t do good work for any teacher who doesn’t like me.”)

In other instances, the authority problem of the student is not tied specifically to either a father or mother figure but appears related to the general family structure and treatment, and to the early responses of the girl as a little child. Here belongs the student who seems submerged by her family, dominated by their restrictions and limitations. She may accept them in toto with the result that she is too shackled to accept education at all, or, like Mabel, she may draw lines between those restrictions she will accept and the points at which for the sake of her own development she will make her own choices.

Another form of authority-dominated approach to education appears in the group of students who are so identified with a rigid set of ideals, or moral standards, or religious principles that certain areas of education are closed to them. Thus Belinda’s teachers complained that her romantic moral ideals interfered with her aesthetic understanding in an art course; Rosalind’s religious loyalty made it impossible for her to understand principles of genetics and evolution; a narrow Puritan morality made it hard for another girl to consider problems of human relationships from other than a rigidly moralistic viewpoint.

A common authority-dependence appears in students who carry over, from *all* their previous education and training, the sense that an older and wiser source will provide the answer: the teacher can give it; certain books, or alas for some

girls, *all* books can give it—and as a student her job is to find out what the book says. This need for answers was a frequent complaint in teacher reports at the beginning of our study of students' interests and needs; the first exploratory courses often threw the student on her own to discover her own truths as well as her own interests. Teachers now realize that this need for answers is often not a superficial result of authoritative secondary-school training, but a need deeply rooted in the students' personality structure, and thus outgrown slowly if at all.

At this point we see most sharply that all of the early experiences of the girl growing up in her segment or segments of our culture define the possibilities which will actually be open to her at college. As a result of those experiences she has developed her own particular combination of patterns of docility, rebelliousness, identification, or independence. This combination of patterns will block or give added stimulus to the experiences offered by the college.

Implications for Guidance

The personality problems within this group may vary in rigidity and resistance to change. Some students who come to college quite dependent, resistant, or given to idealizing authority may grow rapidly, under good handling, toward a more objective and independent relation to their work; others may remain incorrigibly dependent, resistant, or idol worshipping.

The important point here is that students of different authority attitudes may require very different handling. This may have to come from an institution or teacher selected to meet their needs, or from the flexibility of a teacher who is able to give different students differing kinds and amounts of authority. Thus a student who is very dependent on authority may need to have close direction to begin with, with a gradual tapering off as the student achieves more inde-

pendence; a very resistant student may develop confidence in a teacher who gives her freedom at the start but adds direction as she becomes able to accept it.

In the case of students who need specifically masculine or feminine authority, a man and a woman teacher may work coöperatively together and evolve for her a constructive relation to the authority she ignores by taking on temporary roles of father and mother surrogates.

It is to be expected that students with strong authority needs may not be weaned to complete independence; but through identification with the broader values of the college or individual teachers in the college they may still find a wider base for life after college than they could otherwise have had.

SUMMARY OF DYNAMIC FACTORS IN LEARNING

CONTRIBUTIONS to a new understanding of human development are coming from such varied fields as medicine and physiology, anthropology, and various branches of psychology. At certain points these contributions come to a focus and show us that an organism is in many ways unified in its sequences of adjustment and development. The field of psychosomatic medicine is largely concerned with the physical manifestations of emotional maladjustment and anthropological studies have suggested that common patterns of illness in groups may be symptoms of common adjustment problems of those groups. Both Gestalt and psychoanalytic approaches to personality reveal mechanisms of general personality adaptation which are reflected in specific expressions of social or vocational behavior. Books such as *Emotion and the Educative Process*¹ have presented the implications for education to be found in these related fields of research.

Our findings however have been reached by a very different method: the summarizing and organizing of teachers' observations of students. Frequently these observations were made by teachers who had little or no technical knowledge of the principles emerging from the experimental disciplines referred to above; yet what they have recorded is congruent with these principles. The following summary of dynamic principles of learning and growth is offered not as a definitive report of applications of principles of dynamic psychology and related fields but as a condensed statement of generalizations which have emerged from these teachers' observations.

The personality of each student has its own character: it is loosely or tightly organized, around a narrow or broad

¹ American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1938.

group of values, and has relied on its own ways of achieving values and tolerating disappointments. This basic character determines whether and how much a student will become educated in the sense used in this book, and in what terms and by what stages she will grow. The methods used by each character to sustain itself and to grow are the dynamic factors that define the pattern of individual education which we have considered as almost a synonym for growth. They may conveniently be grouped around foci such as these:

- ways of relating oneself to the world of activity, thought and skills; these will underlie the kinds of interests, skills, and activities pursued by a student and the tempo and way she pursues them;
- ways of thinking of oneself in relation to other people, and one's place in the social world of one's peers;
- ways of responding to the world of reality and authority;
- ways of dealing with problems of different kinds: kinds of thinking, feeling and behavior which respond to problems perceived as soluble, and to problems perceived as difficult or insoluble.

Each of these groups will require separate discussion.

Relating Oneself to the World of Activity and Thought

At any age from the preschool level to college level, we find differences such as these: one student has a "drinking-in" orientation; another has the will to master or to accomplish, or to acquire the power of expertness; others want something to do, their interests appear to function as a release, providing an outlet, a "giving-out" experience; in contrast to these are students who have a possessive feeling about their interests in education—in their case amassing learning is almost equivalent to amassing money. These variant feelings are reflected in the attitude toward examinations, which offer the educationally possessive Midas an opportunity to show what he has accumulated but mean little to the doer or to the student whose "drinking-in" is his private satisfaction (and little he cares what the instructor knows or thinks). Similarly, extra-

mural projects will seem to the doer to be the only real education; while the "drinking-in" student may be interested in such projects only as long as they provide him with new opportunities for assimilation. Tasks of writing, reading, organizing material, thinking, criticizing, field work, laboratory work, will be felt as relevant or irrelevant, satisfying or unsatisfying in relation to such orientations as these.

The attitudes mentioned, and others similar to them that will come to the mind of the teacher who reads this, are intimately related to the patterns of sensory and motor response which a student has usually built up by the time he comes to college. Thus, a "drinking-in" child or college student is apt to have a greater sensory than motor development. Visual and auditory experiences furnish excitement to these receptive students. The doer, on the other hand, is apt to have greater motor development. In his case the activity into which he throws himself may be running a recreation club for potentially delinquent children. Much of the high morale noted in some of the newer colleges probably derives from the satisfactions now available to the active students whose natural media of learning are neglected by a program composed of lecture courses only.

If we had complete case studies of college students from birth, we might find that these different orientations—drinking-in, doing, mastering, possessing, releasing—have been characteristic of the child almost from early months, and that they are traceable both to primary preferences of a constitutional sort (since we find babies to whom sensory satisfactions are most important and other babies to whom motor outlets are most important) and to early handling which gave praise or reproof for early motor explorations and satisfaction or disappointment in early sensory experiences.

Other attitudes to be included in this discussion are concerned with the role played by activities. To one student, work interests form a satisfying use of talent and the basis for a contribution to the social group; to another, they represent

an escape from social problems; to another, they provide an avenue to skill, which is felt to be an important defense against insecurities. There are still others to whom work interests are merely gap-fillers in a busy social life, or to whom the activity itself is the chief area of satisfaction. The varying roles played by work interests will determine the value placed on the work—whether it justifies the temporary depletion of great fatigue or is merely worth a lick and a promise.

Oneself in Relation to Other People

Students from different backgrounds bring different assets and handicaps of orientation which influence their work. Students from financially limited groups sometimes exaggerate the gap between their own immaturity and the knowledge of the professionally trained expert and feel that important work is never for them; they accept a static social role which limits not only their conception of what education can do for them but also the zest with which they pursue their education. Students from the so-called privileged classes often suffer from analogous misconceptions; because their acquaintances have been chiefly women of leisure whose main responsibilities were those of hostess, such students cannot imagine themselves as useful and competent in any line of work, nor can they imagine satisfaction from it. In each of these instances the girl's conception of herself in relation to her group limits the level of her educational aspiration, or leads to conflict or to a later awakening. Students from both types of limited background may, however, derive an important stimulus and other assets from the very environment that seemed to handicap those we have just been discussing. Some young people of underprivileged background are challenged to outgrow their limitations; some students from financially privileged homes are stimulated to learn as much as possible about the world they have not known. In each case the individual student's response to her experience is an expression of her own way of structuring her world; and

may be different both from what was done and from what was expected by her parents.

The inner character of her educational experience is also affected by other attitudes toward herself in relation to people. Field work, whether taking the form of active organization or merely of field observation and interviewing, is greatly affected by the unconscious attitudes of open friendliness, of liking people, as compared with timidity, anxiety, or covered hostility toward people as individuals or toward people of different groups. Freedom of exchange of ideas in and out of class is affected by touchiness, negativism, exclusiveness, detachment, or power needs directed toward people; a student cannot be a good member of a class discussion group or of a midnight bull session unless she is sufficiently flexible and socially adaptable to be capable of the give and take which is the stuff of good discussion.

Response to the World of Reality and of Authority

We have discussed in the preceding chapter the importance of passive, dependent, defiant or hostile, coöperative, and identifying attitudes toward authority; these are important in determining a child's response to the varying kinds of authority from the beginning of his school years, and often are considered by parents or advisers in making an intelligent decision about the kind of school or college to which a given student should go. A child may need clear authority because he is dependent upon direction, or because his activities are so scattered by his own conflicting impulses that without external limits they will become disorganized and destructive, bringing no more satisfaction to himself than to the group he is disrupting. Another student may need a more amorphous, less organized situation, one that is relatively free from a directing authority; this is the case if she is too easily limited when authority is given or if she can get along very well and function most productively in a free situation.

From this point of view, students who need a rigid curriculum for the direction it gives will doubtless gravitate toward it and often find great satisfaction in it; some students who need freedom come to colleges like this one in order to get it. Other students prescribe a rigid curriculum for themselves when a freer atmosphere might be better for their growth, and, as we shall see in the case of Anne, students have come here for freedom who were not able to use it to the satisfaction of their teachers, and who succeeded better under a more regimented system.

The significant point is that the student's pattern of response to a given kind of authority is important in determining what use she will make of her educational situation; and that there is no evidence that any one authority pattern in education is good for all students at any given stage of their college work. Some students need freedom in their freshman year but can take increasing direction as they mature. Others must begin with close direction but are able to use freedom more constructively by the end of their college years. Throughout this discussion it is essential to bear in mind the fact that when we speak of a student's need for direction or for freedom, or for a particular combination of both, we do not assume that her character structure is permanently fixed in that mold. A need for direction is always seen—sometimes too optimistically—as a temporary need which if wisely met may yield to a more independent approach as the student grows.

Dealing with Problems

We have noted faculty complaints that some students are too involved in details, while others fly high, wide, and handsome on airy generalizations. Such habitual methods of work may be seen as different ways of dealing with problems, each of which takes on the character of an escape whenever details or abstractions go beyond the point of effectiveness for the purpose they are serving. Both methods appear in students

who are reported by teachers to have difficulty in integrating detail or factual evidence with their generalizations. This difficulty in bringing things into relation often appears in a context of other difficulties in achieving integrated relationships, even with people. In contrast to the evasive method of relying to excess upon either details or abstractions are the following methods: straight repression or defense by denial of the problem; or an attempt to forget it and to go ahead with other jobs. Either of these may lead to partial success, with, however, a considerable residue of tension. Often, more active conflicts arise and these are reflected in worrying attitudes toward work and in an indecisiveness which may affect areas of study not closely connected with the conflict area.

Indirect attacks on problems may sometimes be successful; this occurs when a student who is concerned about a family or sex problem tries to build up general background for approaching it instead of bringing the problem itself into discussion or even into her reading. Even a direct attack may not be effective if the student is excessively objective and does not let herself experience the emotional responses natural to successive phases of dealing with the problem. The indirect approach defeats its purpose when it becomes a compulsive preoccupation with an area of work; the problem is then further and further elaborated, intellectually, without being brought out into the open or near to a solution.

All of these problem-solving attitudes may be contrasted with the direct attack characteristic of certain students who do not feel threatened by any one specific difficulty and who can both think and feel their way through to a solution. The direct attack, however, appears to some teachers to evade the important functions of education, since often a teacher wants to see that the student sets any problem in a broad, intellectual perspective, whether the student wants this or not. In short, the desirable approach from a mental-hygiene point of view is not necessarily the one which all teachers will accept.

Whatever the approach of the student, there will be points at which her ways of solving problems will conform or conflict with the expectations of teachers concerning effective procedures in work. Whether the student gets educated or not may depend partly on the answer to the question whether the teacher's ways of elaborating problems intellectually, and of retreating into details or into abstractions serve to reinforce or counteract a student's evasions, to defeat or sustain her efforts at solving problems important to her.

Intimately related to the ways of dealing with problems just discussed are the ways of thinking and working which teachers have been so much concerned about in the records that lie behind this book. Teachers generally have wanted students to develop an integrated ability to reason, understand, create, with freedom from excess emotional freight and with an inner unity of feeling and thought and the constructive use of emotion. Such unity emerges from the quality of adjustment which a student's way of solving problems has given her. If she has evaded, repressed, or in other ways inadequately dealt with, the most important problems in her life she may carry a weight of anxiety, of unresolved tension, which is reflected in the disintegration of thought and feeling observed by faculty. She cannot organize her ideas, think straight, focus on new facts long enough to remember them, or respond to new problems outside the arena of her little egocentric world of tension, until she has learned how to deal with her basic problems comfortably. She cannot communicate her feelings in expressive areas such as singing, piano, visual arts, or writing, as long as her energy is consumed by the effort to hold conflicts under rein. If she has resorted to the safety of mechanical routines as a way of coping with difficulty she may have trouble responding to new insights, ideas, and perceptions.

In a nutshell, her deepest patterns of dealing with life will be reflected in her work as well as her social relations; each

of the case studies in Part II will in some way illustrate this thesis and in a few cases we can see how finding a solution released a student for the kind of integrated educational development expected by her teachers. (See Patsy, pp. 356 ff.)

PART II: INDIVIDUAL STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

THE FOLLOWING SUMMARIES of a group of life histories of students in college will be clearer if we outline briefly how the records for these studies came into being. Certain records are routine at the college; these include written reports from each instructor consulted by a student in the days of registration; four reports per year by each of the teachers and the adviser with whom she is working, based on weekly conferences as well as upon class and written work; and summary notes by the Student Work Committee, which reviews the status of each student and also consults with the teachers of students who have presented special problems. The nature of these reports will be clear from the quotations in the longer case studies. In addition to these, weekly notes on certain students were kept by teachers of special courses for freshmen who received financial aid from the General Education Board. Henry Ladd organized the data from these sources for his first draft of each case study, then completed the studies with the aid of special records made by teachers working with these students in their last two years.

The use of these records for the case summaries differs from the use made of them by teachers at work. In practice, teachers who know one another will constantly weigh observations of one against another in the light of their opinion of the habitual bias of each teacher, as well as her tendencies to dramatize, defend, minimize or identify with given attitudes and ways of behaving. One teacher is typically optimistic, another is generally overprotective, another hard-boiled. This balancing of data is of course especially necessary when the picture of a student is only partially complete, as during freshman year, and when any given discussion may be heavily weighted with impressionistic or technical comments, ex cathedra diagnoses or premature conclusions. For these case studies the observations of teachers are more guarded, being

"on the record," and are treated additively on the assumption that since each study is based on the observations of several teachers in each of several years, the total picture will have added validity because of the broad base from which it grows. Nevertheless, blind spots, projections, differences in standards will appear and must be accepted as an almost inevitable result of the ambitious attempt to probe the deeper springs of motivation in work and social life. We do not excuse them. We believe they occur universally in evaluating students in every institution and are quite as real behind more objective-looking marks as they are in obviously subjective records. We feel that the best way to get beyond them is to continue to exchange observations of students, to continue to try to understand them, and to try in addition to learn how to correct our own blind spots and biases through this exchange.

It is not easy to see "the whole student"; we have to watch not only the quality of her work, but the meaning of this to her in relation to her present growth and future prospects, and the hypothesis growing from the process must be constantly checked and evaluated. To a large extent this is the task of the Student Work Committee, comprising the Director of Education, the Psychiatrist and three members elected by the faculty. This group has all the data available but lacks the personal contact which often involves a degree of identification with the student important for her security but not a good guarantee of objective evaluation of her. Thus the raw material of teachers' reports, each with its inarticulate as well as articulate value systems and educational philosophy, undergoes a careful process of sifting by the Student Work Committee. In this process, personalities of individual teachers and dons as sources of information are themselves sifted and evaluated, and corrections, suggestions, and conclusions are referred back to the teachers and adviser.

The long reports on studies by Henry Ladd include four students who are followed through four years of college (ex-

cept Fern who left college after three years). These four students differ greatly in abilities and in personality. Priscilla is a girl of the highest scholastic aptitude, Louise is of average ability, while Fern and Hortense are of limited ability, according to the American Council Test. Fern and Hortense share the quality of determined pursuit of their own very different goals. Louise and Priscilla have difficulty over a long period of time in different ways in identifying with clear goals; Priscilla does outstanding work, however, and Louise's achievement was considerable, although her teachers all felt dissatisfied with her irregular written work. In the cases of these two girls, family pressures and problems created tension that interfered with the deepest relation to interests or goals. Louise's related problem of ambivalent attitude toward authority appeared to underlie her tendency always to see two sides of a question so irresistibly that any final conclusion was impossible to reach. Like some other students, but in contrast with Priscilla whose family problems led to an urgent desire to understand and to get as much help as possible from psychology and related sciences, Louise dodged any direct attack on her problems via psychology.

Both Priscilla and Louise shared a desire to prove their ability to a skeptical male authority, uncle or father, and in both cases this defensive stimulus did not lead to a stable, growing interest. Both needed help, but got it a very different way: Priscilla objectified and analyzed her problems, while from time to time Louise accepted scraps of insight offered by the understanding and discreet adviser. Both girls showed growth: Priscilla's lay in her ability to face and deal with family problems; Louise's, in her acceptance of and insight into herself—her practical sound understanding contributed in the end to her grasp of literature. This was in many ways a contrast to Priscilla: it was possible for her to understand people in books that she had not understood at home and to carry this into a greater acceptance of these real people. Yet at times Fern and Priscilla both shared the

experience of working through their own problems via literature.

Louise, Fern, and Hortense all shared feelings of inadequacy which were expressed or compensated for in different ways. Louise's way was that of flighty, scattered activity; Hortense developed a tight defensive rigidity expressed in scornful superior attitudes toward her own age group as well as in overdressed clothes; Fern tackled and conquered one area of insecurity at a time—first her own age group, then the faculty. With both Fern and Hortense improvement followed the achievement of greater security in one area. Appreciation and being given lots of rope at certain periods performed an important function for both.

Along with these similarities there were many fundamental contrasts between these girls, and the reader will find illustrations of a number of points discussed in Part I: the cumulative character of intellectual growth; the release of increased ability in a new field after the achievement of maturity in one area; Fern's need for a "structured" type of material and clear directions, and Louise's need of freedom from heavy authoritative pressure; the failure of direct suggestion with Hortense and the success of indirect approaches.

Space limitation has required that the studies as originally written be cut to half of their original length or less. This has been done by eliminating large amounts of documentary material and in some cases by condensing the discussion. In all cases I have tried to retain the structure and insights which Henry Ladd gave to these studies; some of them were finished; others were in an incomplete stage but are included because the material seemed to justify it. I have also attempted not to produce a finished tidy result but to retain for the reader the experience of learning with the teachers who were learning about their students—with some of the repetitions and contradictions which slow accumulations and observations involve, and with no masking of the trial and error

process followed by teachers attempting to understand and work with these students.

These studies will, we hope, correct some false impressions that may have arisen from the observations in Part I. If it appeared that problems of attitude toward authority, or toward learning, could easily be divorced from other aspects of the student's relation to work—whether she appeared shy or hostile to the teachers, rigidly overorganized or scattered and disorganized in her work habits—these studies make it clear that such a divorce can only occur by abstraction. At the level of the student-at-work, Anne's need for being liked by the teacher, the brilliance of her insights in the warm situation of a conference with a teacher who likes her, the absence of further development and organization of these insights when she is away from the conference situation, are all of a piece.

The striking visual gifts of Hortense, coupled with her limited or slowly developing intellectual capacities at a broader level, were doubtless rooted in constitutional factors. But for the rest—her lack of real warmth and genuine relations with other girls, her lack of ability to feel life deeply, her snobbery and prestige values—were a part of her relations with people and constituted an equally deep basis for the limitations of her work. We could go through all these eleven studies in this fashion and show how, in each case, what the student is in her basic self—her deepest values and needs—provides the direction and limitations of her work at any given time, and her development through her years in college.

AMBITION, NARROW TALENT, AND A RIGID PERSONALITY: HORTENSE

HORTENSE came to college with a very definite purpose: she wanted either to take an A.B. in art, or to have two years of preparatory work in college and then to study art in Europe. By art she did not mean the history of art, she meant "doing it." She said in her application form that she wanted to do things for herself and do them well. She said, "I want to become an individual and not just a member of a crowd. . . . I want to be with the people I'd like to have for friends the rest of my life." She chose Sarah Lawrence because it would further these purposes and because of its good art courses and its nearness to New York City, and added, "It also had other courses that I'd like to fit into my study of art."

Her initial registration interviews were marked by a defensive attitude; she almost but not quite said, "What a waste of my time; I know what I want, why talk about it!" However, she made an effort to comply, to state her reasons for wanting to take certain courses clearly and finally. This gave her a brittle, rather prim aspect which fitted with her extremely neat, orderly appearance: the line of the lip rouge was exact; the blonde hair tightly and intricately coiffured; the whole effect just a little "dressed up." So, too, were her replies—neat and just a little dressed up.

Hortense was eighteen. She came from a family which had achieved considerable social and financial success. Both parents were graduates of a Western university, and her father was president of a large industrial concern. Hortense had become conscious of the social privileges and position of her family—at least she talked about them more than many students do. She had no brothers, had one sister considerably younger than herself. Hortense had been sent to a school of excellent academic reputation and was nineteenth in a class

of 53 when she graduated. She was said to have special ability in art, to have been active in school affairs, but to have a narrower interest than the school community. This was qualified by an allusion to her social position, which for some reason or other seems to have been considered relevant: "she has a place [family position] naturally, and doesn't have to make one for herself."

There was no doubt that Hortense felt she knew why she had come to college and what she wanted from college. If motivation was to be judged by the spoken word, this was clear: she wanted art, and she "wanted art in a practical way" because it was "practical with her hands" and because she had been advised to specialize in ceramics. She would not listen to arguments about a complete or full training. To one teacher who suggested literature she replied that it might be "useful in becoming acquainted with people and situations outside the studio." To another teacher's suggestion of social psychology she replied that she had heard of it but wanted to know for what it could be useful. She appeared to both teachers timid, stubborn, and determined to get what she came for. The teachers advised the Registration Committee that "something should be done to lead her—gently, because she will resist any efforts that she can see coming—into other fields."

The advice was precisely followed; certain teachers were suggested to her for consultation in the areas of literature and psychology. She had insisted that she must take history of art because her mother wished it—she didn't have any other reason; she was also convinced that one would have, she supposed, to take literature. She saw several of the teachers mentioned and expeditely settled her program: ceramics and design, introduction to literature and introduction to psychology. She gave no sign of change in her fundamental attitude. She understood the literature and psychology were necessary but by no means interesting adjuncts to the art studio. Her adviser became the teacher in the literature course.

After four weeks Hortense indicated as politely as possible to her adviser that she could not continue in the psychology course. Arrangements were made for her to shift into a course called *The Child in the Family*, where the approach to psychological problems was less academic, the procedures in individual work more flexible, and the material concerned chiefly with child psychology. Toward the end of the year it was also arranged for the teacher in the art studio to become her adviser, because Hortense's interest suggested a basis for closer and perhaps more constructive rapport.

The attitude of the three teachers toward Hortense and her work is unusually consistent and reflects the degree to which the work in the different fields meant something to her. Neither her literature nor her psychology teacher could see any real development during the first year. The former rated her achievement and capacity as moderate. The latter rated her capacity for college work as slight but her achievement rose to moderate in the middle of the year and then slid back to slight. Her effort in these courses was frequently cited as uneven but often strong effort was shown. In ceramics and design her achievement was consistently good; toward the end of the year her effort was uneven, but her capacity was rated good; her total development, however, was rated only moderate. At the end of the year there was general agreement that little had occurred in Hortense's education, but no one of her teachers was willing to have her dropped. Even her psychology teacher, in whose course Hortense had shown the least sustained interest and effort, recommended that she continue toward the two-year diploma, but that she might need three years to get it.

In a good many ways the year was indirectly profitable to Hortense; her teachers came closer to understanding her—at least to the point where they agreed that it would be vain to attempt a broadening process by direct exposure to a variety of subjects. Her literature teacher and her adviser agreed at the end of the year that any education she was to

get would have to come by following her dominant and, at the present time exclusive, interest in art. This conclusion was reached after a great variety of trial and error in the literature course (which was especially planned for exploring the possibilities of a student) and a very flexible program of work in psychology.

Some brief indication of the nature of Hortense's behavior and her attitudes may be useful in suggesting the problem facing the adviser at the end of the year. In both courses records were kept of the reading done, as well as some account of conferences, and many notes on remarks made by Hortense that suggested her attitudes toward the world she lived in as well as the subjects she was studying.

Hortense had a very clear sense of what her obligations were. Soon after changing to the course on *The Child in the Family* she submitted a paper covering "make-up" reading; it was illogical, badly stated, contained the merest trace of books read, but nevertheless it was done. She told the teacher that she loved the course, and she meant it, evidently; but this did not keep her from being inattentive in class a great deal of the time. She began observing in the nursery school. Somewhat the same conflict between will and spirit appeared in her participation and contacts with children. She was by turns timid or aggressive, conscientious but generally inept. She herself admitted that she often thought the children should be spanked and that she was afraid of doing the wrong thing with them. When she took part in playing or working with them she would occasionally help them too much with drawing and have to be restrained. She noticed only obvious things about the school and was not very observant of the children. During December, January, and February she worked consistently and intelligently on a project on children's art. She became genuinely interested; and spent some time during vacation giving tests to children near her home. During this period her attitude toward the teacher shifted markedly from one of pleasant diffidence to that of an in-

terested co-worker. She had serious moments of fear before handing in her project, but was reassured by its success, took criticism in the most constructive way and followed every single suggestion before presenting her report to the class early in March.

During a short unit of lectures presenting biological information on the nervous system, on heredity, and glands, she lost interest, but was attentive to a lecture on determination of sex and on disease. Her second project was much less successful than that on children's art. She had suggested studying the feeble-minded, but was quite willing to shift to the subject of Special Abilities in Children at the teacher's suggestion. She began with some show of resolution but constant pressure was needed to keep her at the task. The result was perfunctory. Toward the end of the year her work dropped to the minimum. She was able to maintain a frank and well-intentioned attitude with the teacher in conference, but classwork was obviously a bore.

During the middle of the year Hortense had a long conference with her teacher about her family. She introduced the subject herself, as it was relevant to certain class discussions on the child in the family. The record offers the following summary:

Hortense stayed an extra hour to rage over her parents' treatment of her. She commented on her father's insistence that she keep a detailed account of expenditures. If her books don't balance, he sends them back to her to straighten out. At this time she was highly incensed because she had telephoned asking for permission to go to the Dartmouth Carnival with a man whom the family did not know. She also commented briefly that she was not allowed to have many week-ends, that she is never allowed to stay at a New York hotel, that it's no fun to go home for holiday week-ends because her friends are away. She built up a picture of her mother as a submissive individual who tries to placate the father.

On this same occasion she went into detail about early memories of teachers, spoke of how she hated her sixth grade teacher who had accused her unjustly of having kept a pedometer over the

summer months. The teacher herself found it in the fall, but Hortense has never forgiven her for the accusation.

She also discussed her early relation to her younger sister. Says that she remembers climbing into the crib with the young baby and of being severely scolded. She also remembers having raided the pantry and of having divided a box of cookies with the young baby and of the scolding she got in that connection. She seemed to me to present much of the typical adolescent rebellion characteristic of aggressive personalities who have been held down by parents.

The routine aspects of Hortense's work in literature were satisfactory so far as moral effort was concerned; she did all her tasks. Her reading, however, was without imagination or sympathy; her writing unclear and without mechanical facility of any kind; she could not express herself well orally. She was far from silent and appeared to enjoy participation in any and all discussions, but "her chatter," notes one of her teachers, "was either difficult to understand, or made up of clichés of the 'liberty but not license' type." She enjoyed firing off generalizations picked up here and there.

The reading of the course ranged through a great variety of types and subjects, from controversial essays on social, religious, or moral topics to highly imaginative pieces of fiction. Hortense was tangled in a mass of prejudices, which represented, it appeared, the intellectual climate of her home. This was not surprising, but the immersion in prejudice was so complete, "the clinging so tenacious, as to render her outstanding" in the teacher's experience. "It seems at times," he notes, "as if her very life depended upon her defending to the last ditch the family's way of life and thought."

It was difficult to tell what she really was. Her exterior and much of her behavior presented a hard, enameled complacency which fitted the hypothesis that she was really a very practical minded little "go-getter." On the other hand, the tendency to take everything personally or to relate it to her own and her family's world and to be completely final about

it seemed at times to suggest a defense against some desperate insecurity. With this fitted her extreme snobbery; she seemed sure of her position in her own little world, incurious about anything outside it and quite sure that the people outside of her set did not really count. Would she have been so certain they did not matter if she had not been essentially afraid of them or something they represented? Her behavior in the ceramics studio also suggested this necessity for demonstrating her technical superiority, her advanced knowledge, not once or twice, but again and again. There appeared to be a compulsion continually to prove herself the authority on methods and technique, particularly in relation to other students.

By the end of the term Hortense had had, in her own opinion, quite enough "broadening." She stated in no uncertain terms that her program for next year must consist in painting, sculpture, and history of art. To the suggestion that this was perhaps unduly specialized, she replied, "Well, I came here to study art." When it was asked, "Why didn't you go to art school?" Hortense paused and was very patient in her exact answer: "I came here so that I could get something besides art. Now I have got it, and I can go ahead and study art."

Her adviser summarizes the situation toward the end of May:

She has a quick reaction to ideas and materials in the studio. Her first expression is often negative—but not always. She questions a new method of procedure or a tedious one before she accepts it. For example, she was one of the first in the group to understand the painting instructor's tie-up with biology and work from the model, but she saw no reason why he did not begin at another point which seemed to her more logical. . . . I watched her closely after that. . . . She was using his method of building up form, but was beginning with the head rather than room space as had been suggested. She was making good sketches.

She is outstanding in descriptive geometry [short unit connected with art]. She is able to visualize forms very quickly and enjoys it very much.

She has had previous work in ceramics. This confidence and her natural interest in showing people what to do caused some confusion at the beginning of the year. Our methods seemed slow and wasteful of energy to her. . . . Students do not have an unkindly feeling toward her even if she is a little bossy. . . . But one said to me, "Isn't it a shame Hortense doesn't take more pains with her work? If she did she could do anything." But I see that she is taking more pains all the time. . . . It also took time to convince her that the chemistry of glazes was of value. She said, "You can buy better colors, and to work out colors and to put them on tiles is too slow." But the intellectual manipulation interests her . . . she has done good work in spurts in this.

From my experience and talks with her about her work in general, I feel that she may run into great difficulties . . . that the careful planning of next year's work will be of greatest importance. Because she needs wider experience or broadening is no reason she can take it.

The final conclusion accorded perfectly with the comment of her literature teacher: "Art is where her talent lies, and it is in that area, and that area alone, that she sees any point in learning anything, or has the least curiosity. Anything which can be done for her educationally must start there."

Without further discussion her adviser proceeded upon this hypothesis for discussing her second-year program. Because of the interest in the short unit in geometry and her excellent rapport with the teacher who conducted this, Hortense was quite willing to try a course in physics. The academic humanities and social sciences were put aside and she was encouraged to work full time in both painting and sculpture.

Her record during the second year demonstrates the wisdom of the hypothesis upon which the program was planned. It is not merely that her achievements are rated better than the year before, and considerably above the level which the intelligence tests indicate, but after the middle of the year there are no more comments upon her trying to boss people. When the Committee on Student Work interviews her faculty in the spring, questioning whether or not she should re-

ceive the diploma this year or spend another year working toward it, her three teachers were united in recommending not only the diploma but a return to college for junior and senior work. Her talent in painting and sculpture is recognized; in the latter her final rating is high, beyond that of most college students, in the former the rating is well above college average.

In the physics course she is rated moderate in capacity with better than moderate achievement. She responds readily to criticism, that is, she improves in her reporting on experiments and in reading, which were her weak points at the beginning of the year. She was consistently good in laboratory work. At the beginning of the year she tended not to listen to other students in class, which might well have been a gesture of the sort of superiority she had demonstrated the year before. But this disappears; from the middle of the year on, the reports refer to her participation in class as excellent.

In sculpture, she began the year with remarkable achievement in drawing and modeling in clay. When she came to cutting stone there appeared a striking difficulty; it took some time for her to learn to think in these terms. In one so gifted in manual techniques these exceptions are striking. Her last work in both stone and clay was, however, of a high standard. Before the end of the year her whole attitude toward painting had changed. She had become intensely interested and thoughtful about it; all dilettantism had disappeared; there is no doubt that she was a different person in this studio from the one who had entered at the beginning of the year.

When it came to forming a program for the third year, Hortense was as rigid about wishing to specialize as she had ever been. Her adviser, now her instructor in painting, continued to accept a stubborn limitation. He insisted only on history of art besides sculpture and painting. The Committee on Student Work insisted on some one other course outside the department of art. Hortense chose to work in mathematics.

The whole year went well for Hortense. Her work in mathematics was consistently satisfactory; her only difficulty was an initial incomprehension of analytic methods. In painting her consistent interest and strong effort achieved results considerably beyond college level. In the history of art her capacity was markedly enlarged and there was no doubt in the teacher's mind that the year had been one of genuine progress. In sculpture only, Hortense failed to fulfill the expectations of the instructor, who had perhaps been led the year before to expect greater success than could be attained; or, perhaps, Hortense had discovered gradually that painting was her more promising field. The reports in June on this student present a striking contrast to those reports at the end of her first year in college.

INTRODUCTORY MATHEMATICS.—This student has done a very good year's work in this course. Her sense of geometry was very good. Although at first she had great difficulty in stating analytically a problem which she could see geometrically, she worked especially on this aspect and with success. Her effort has been consistently even and the quantity of her work quite satisfactory.

HISTORY OF ART.—This student has done good work. She has, through conscious and persistent effort, developed a more flexible point of view and the ability to distinguish between subjective and objective judgments. The historical explanations of changes in form qualities have grown clearer as the year has progressed. She has become increasingly able to assemble material, to generalize from data and to formulate her findings even when they differ from her own personal beliefs and principles.

DRAWING AND PAINTING.—Hortense possesses by nature the faculty of "visual thinking." Her work has been very good, and she did two pictures this year which had to be judged by professional standards. They were good. A steady progress in her work is evident. Her understanding of color, line and space increased to such a degree that I hope the student will not relax and be satisfied with an intelligent solution of an artistic problem which eventually could lead to purely mechanic-technical calculation. Observation of nature, drawing after nature, painting after nature; nature and concentrated observation of nature in every phase of her work is absolutely necessary—otherwise, I am afraid, her whole development as a person and a painter may come to a standstill.

This warning shall also suggest that other points of interest, studies (and life itself) have to be more intimately connected with her major interest.

SCULPTURE.—The work of Hortense during the past year has been surprisingly unstable. She has shown the same ease in handling material as she did last year, the same manual ability, but her emotional responses have been at times noticeably absent. Almost every successful work of the year has been followed by an extreme failure.

This last group, although not quite finished, shows definitely that on the whole Hortense has matured a great deal.

Hortense had enlisted throughout two years the interest and enthusiasm of the art faculty. By the end of her third year she had a folder full of complimentary reports—on the whole far above the average. The demand by her art teachers at the end of her second year that she return for advanced work in college seemed to have been quite justified by her achievements. Her range was narrow to be sure, but could not the educational problem confronting her adviser at the end of the first year be now peacefully dismissed? Could she not be put down as a student of specialized talent who could make a brilliant record if left to work in areas wholly congenial to her? Why should not this be considered the answer to whatever questions remained? There seemed from the evidence of her academic reports good reason to suppose that she would continue her progress in these limited fields during the fourth year and graduate with a fine record, provided the Committee could be persuaded to consider her narrow range sufficient for an A.B.

Unfortunately, this peaceful dismissal of the educational problem was not possible even for the teachers in the specialized areas. The questionnaires of the second year still indicated a regrettable rigidity—regrettable, that is, to the teachers. The reports also indicated a certain dissatisfaction, almost a fear, that so good a talent would resist development and would therefore not fulfill its promise. Other material alluded to Hortense's relation with her family as a disturbing factor

in her prospective career; there was more than one allusion to the fact that her social life was not really adequate.

For example, one finds her most enthusiastic teacher in sculpture commenting in a report to Hortense: "I feel that with two more years of hard work you will develop thoroughly what your work now promises. The only danger lies in the possibility of your stopping the process of developing in order that you might produce completed art objects." From her painting teacher came the advice that "a greater turn-out of work is necessary," not because Hortense is at all lazy but because she tends to want constantly to finish things, and this very perfectionism inhibits growth. Confidentially, this teacher made a very significant comment: he listed as follows the things she could and did do best in the order of her capacity: experimenting, constructing, observing, feeling. It is fairly obvious from the reports of both teachers that if Hortense is really to develop as an artist, this order will have to be changed somewhat. "Feeling" cannot remain the least of her capacities, unless her art is to become a routine, mechanized craft of tricks and puzzles. On the other hand, when her painting teacher was asked at the end of the second year if he thought Hortense could now go into commercial art and make a success of it, his answer was negative. He thought she could develop great skill in commercial processes, but as a designer would quickly "go dead."

It was observed at this time that Hortense's success during the second year appeared to have come from the fact that she was working in material that had no immediate connection with people, their feelings, and their attitudes. It was further noticed that, in both sculpture and painting, Hortense tended to avoid subjects which one might call "human interest" topics; she worked with greatest interest and skill on subjects connected rather with the material world than a particularly humanized world. How could education break down this limitation?

An indication that Hortense was feeling a sense of conflict

with her family and their ideals for her appeared in this year. Her adviser's confidential report in the middle of the year said that her work could have more educational value if she were not so worried about the diploma—which "is of great importance to her family." Later in the year in confidential notes he remarked that she indulged in a little boasting, both in her work and in her conversations. "The reason: her apparently very aggressive family." At the same time he noted that she frequently asked for comment and approval, as if needing extra support in the face of criticism from home. He added that her work suffered from a too great dependence upon the interest of her teachers, and observed that sometimes she strove for attention in the studio.

It is at this time also that her fellow students began to gossip a little about Hortense's interest in men and that she herself was a little ostentatious about her superiority to the ordinary run of boys, making allusion to her wide "experience." Her actual absence record showed a marked lack of social activity of the usual college type. She was quite clearly interested in building a reputation, and perhaps not very conscious of the methods she was using to accomplish this, which appear to be just another form of the boasting already observed. At the same time she felt herself a bit of an authority on "humor" in her actual painting and delighted in the idea that few could see the humor behind the puzzle in her composition on the canvas. Her openly defensive attitude toward criticism of her work or her person remained, but she nevertheless accepted criticism and acted upon it, however much she attempted to defend herself. She still entered all discussion with a rather challenging attitude, but was less apt to be caught with no point, and had begun to develop patience in listening to other points of view, at least in the discussion in art and physics.

The combination of unusual talent with such marked rigidity and lack of emotional depth interested the research staff. Hortense was asked to coöperate in a study of educa-

tional experiments and to take a Rorschach test. She willingly did this, remaining a little superior and unconcerned, though seizing every opportunity to impress her superiority upon the person giving the test. Up to this time Hortense had received very little praise and she was just now beginning the concentration in arts which she had been struggling to get. The aggressive and somewhat "show-off" character of her reaction to taking the test may be somewhat the result of this situation. The interpretation of the test by a specialist outside the college is as follows:

Hortense is the sort of person who likes to impress others with the fact that she is extraordinary. Her whole behavior is calculated for effect. She would like to be something special and tries by suggestion to influence other people to accept this ideal. If others believe in her, her self-confidence is greatly increased, and she outdoes herself still more in the display of her fascinations.

Her show-off mechanism takes on various forms. She throws crumbs of information around as though she were very well informed on scientific matters and were very well educated in general, and conjures up far-distant, and, to her, fine-sounding, worlds, in order to attract others to her. At the same time she treats other people with condescension in order to emphasize her superiority.

She is able to maintain this attitude only at the beginning of a new situation, at the first meeting with people. The foundations are too frail, her actual feeling of self-confidence too much disturbed, for her to be able to preserve the attitude. Looked at more deeply, she is tormented by great fears and by a very wavering self-assurance, so that she is quite empty and is shivering inwardly. When strong emotions threaten to overpower her, she cannot maintain her pretentious attitude and does not feel so imposing and superior any more, but very small, helpless and dependent. She then feels constrained, overshadowed, delivered up to others who are stronger than she is. She offers defiant, rebellious resistance, shows her teeth, puts on again her air of originality, is, however, full of a fear which does not leave her in peace, but which, indeed, pursues her constantly. She does not intend to let herself be caught, others are not to see through her artifices or to dare to criticize her; she herself will provide the mask which fits her, and no one has anything to say about it. But finally she becomes exhausted and has to give in. This is the conflict and battle which takes place

again and again, in which she is overcome, but which she always takes up again rebelliously. This is a battle for nothing less than her prestige and the wish to dictate to others how and in what way she is unique. A really creative substance is entirely lacking. She conceals ignorance behind vague, indefinite, relative statements, whose meaning is just as obscure to her as it is to others, but in so doing she would like to pose mysterious riddles and once more make herself interesting. By means of this vague, indefinite behavior she avoids committing herself and leaves a way clear for retreat.

She is quite intelligent and also has artistic interests, but because she has shut herself off from full participation in an objective or personal problem, she can progress only up to a certain superficial point which is quickly reached. She has decided possibilities for development which should be encouraged and strengthened. Her further development will depend very much on whether she succeeds in throwing off her mask. Even though there may be occasional outbursts of defiance and restrained indignation on her part toward her surroundings, she can probably overcome her difficulties, particularly with friendly encouragement and assistance.

"The friendly encouragement and assistance" continued, as we have seen, through her third year in college, when her work in mathematics and painting and sculpture received both praise and constructive criticism. The periods "of defiance and restrained indignation" were not in evidence and there was much less boasting. The superiority to students in the studio—so much in evidence during the first two years—became less and less marked. Hortense made more acquaintances on the campus and several good friends in the dormitories. She was recognized by other students as definitely a genius in the studios, and with this recognition she became much more tolerant and friendly, however, carefully guarding her association with girls to the selection of a fairly small "set." On the other hand, in the studios she was more democratic, taking an interest in the work of various younger students who were socially quite outside her immediate group of friends. She even showed marked gestures of kind-

ness for certain wayward students who would leave their brushes unwashed. Without saying anything about it she was observed occasionally to "clean up" for them. But these favors were extended to students whose talent or sensitiveness she respected. Apparently they were not favors of a social nature, for in spite of finding a place on the campus Hortense seemed to make no intimate contacts. A slightly older student once remarked to one of the teachers that Hortense was a very puzzling person; she thought she saw more of her than any other student on the campus, yet she did not know her. She thought that Hortense had only one intimate friend in college and that was her teacher in painting; on the other hand, the student wondered if anyone really knew Hortense.

These remarks had been made spontaneously and had been entirely unsolicited. They constitute an extension of one of the criticisms of Hortense's work which appeared throughout the third year's reports in painting and sculpture—that is, the observation of her tendency to systematize or mechanize her work rather than to relate it closely to herself and make it the medium of expression of deep feeling; that, as we noted earlier, she avoided "human" material. This was particularly marked in sculpture during the third year but there are several allusions to the same tendency in the reports from painting. For example, her adviser writes in December in his confidential report, "She dislikes to show her own imagination and emotion because, I think, she feels that it might be misunderstood by her parents." Again, as we have seen in the final report from this teacher, there is the fear that she will "relax" and be satisfied with "an intelligent" solution of an artistic problem, and that this will eventually lead to "a mechanico-technical calculation" and the final stultification of her personality as an artist as well as a person.

These observations by teachers and students, together with the Rorschach report at the end of the third year, present a vivid educational problem. In spite of the fact that they

refer to quite distinct kinds of experience, they may be summarized in four distinct ways, in the form of questions to which they are all related.

1. What modification is there during four years to the rigid prejudice which this student manifested at the beginning of her course? Was there anywhere any gain in objectivity?

2. What modifications were there in her attitude toward students and toward social life of those about her?

3. What changes appear in her attitude toward her family, which at first had consisted in one of proud defiance of anything which in any way differed from the home culture?

4. Finally, what changes appear in herself, particularly in relation to ambition or the breadth of feeling and experience which she brings to her chosen work? Is there any deepening of feeling, increase of sensitiveness, mastery of skills, freedom of expression?

Evidence toward any conclusions points in two apparently contradictory directions, thus dramatizing any expectations one may have for her fourth year. For example, mathematics offered Hortense a chance of mastery of technique as well as an area of intellectual and imaginative discovery. It is clear that she enjoyed the first; her success in manipulating mathematical formulas is marked; but there is no indication that she has in any real way sensed the challenge of the second opportunity. In painting she found her dominant field of adventure. In two canvases she achieved actual distinction, but the final report, as we have seen, carries a warning. It is an open question at this point, even though her aims have become professional, how deeply related to herself her work in painting is.

On the other hand, confidential notes reveal marked changes: a moderate increase in depth of feeling and a marked change toward objectivity, toward greater spontaneity, co-operation and a general sense of security. There is stronger effort but she is calmer; she is more submissive to criticism, and tends to turn her resentment into teasing the teacher. She asks for appraisal rather than approval, but still asks for

it very often. Perhaps the most significant development in all this work is a new and conscious interest in people, which, as we have noted, had never before appeared. Toward the end of the year she is definitely trying to "bring her feelings about people into form"; she calls this a psychological interest and pretends toward some objectivity. Her instructor in painting says that he believes "this student is trying to organize (in terms of painting) her own inner situation in relationship with people, which she cannot organize right now in 'real life.'" Finally, toward the end of the year she has adopted a less calculating attitude toward her work and seemed to grasp the meaning of her teacher's aphorism that "proper grammar doesn't make poetry."

The teacher who worked with her in the history of art stressed the fact that a slight gain in objectivity might be considered in her case a marked educational change. She agreed in part that Hortense's attitude toward her family was ambiguous. She referred to the attitude as "built up." There was some evidence, she said, that Hortense did not really want them to understand her aims. She tended to doubt the fact of any serious antagonism on the part of the family; the mother had spoken highly of what the college had done for Hortense and seemed eager to have a second daughter enter at a later time. (The daughter actually came.)

This teacher found another puzzling contradiction in Hortense's attitude. She observed that Hortense would take "any amount of correction and criticism if it is given to her man to man as from one contemporary to another," but that she is otherwise antagonistic to conventional authority and tends to be contemptuous of conventional patterns in the art of her own time. Somewhat the same ambiguity appears in her social attitude as the teacher observes it. "Through all the blatant discussions of *men*, as Hortense calls them, she really feels markedly unsuccessful." Furthermore, Hortense admits to an inadequate social life because of its interference with

concentration on her work; but at the same time, students refer without solicitation to her "over-eager" personal relationships or at least her discussion of them.

Her interests in the history of art lay close to the work she did in painting. She became interested in extending her knowledge of form into the field of architecture; she became interested in certain aesthetic questions because she felt she must have an aesthetic basis for her painting; she was also interested in the study of nineteenth- and twentieth-century German art because she felt that her own work had a relation to this development and that such study would give her perspective. Concerning her prejudices, this teacher notes that these still remain in spite of considerable progress toward objectivity.

She has spoken herself of a feeling that she must make an attempt to understand her own prejudices, to evaluate the grounds upon which she takes her position. She often says that this is something she does not want people to know. She prefers to keep it to herself—this is true—but she has come to realize that if she is going to live with people it is necessary to see that there is another point of view. This is almost a direct quotation from unsolicited comments. Hortense's prejudices have shown up chiefly in relation to the Soviet Union and in relation to kinds of painting which are removed from her own. The first contract which she did in the fall was the result of a trip during the summer to Russia. Her unconsidered condemnation of the Communist regime and the particular anger with which she spoke of their art made it seem a good field for investigation. The end at which she arrived was not one of accepting Russian art, but she no longer spoke in such unqualified generalities and she brought in evidence both for and against the present official attitude in Russia.

Perhaps most significant for an understanding of Hortense's attitude toward her work and her career is this teacher's observation:

More than anything Hortense wants to be thought of as an artist. She wants the students to think she is high-strung and she includes her family in this. Really she is not quite the material from which to make this type and now that her dogmatic representation of

certain ideas upon which she based her aesthetic theories is weakening, she is beginning to take a more pleasant place in relation to other students and to the faculty members.

In planning a fourth-year program, Hortense's adviser at last departed from narrow specialization. But he did not present this change to her on any principle of academic broadening or liberal education; he pointed out that "it is important for a person with a definite talent in one field to meet faculty engaged in creative work in other fields." He also stressed the fact that Hortense had missed, so far, the "artistic experience of literature and music." These two arguments convinced her completely. On her own form for registration she reproduced this argument exactly: her main purpose for further work is to "continue painting—connect this with the two other arts, writing and composing"; she adds further, that she wishes "to know someone who writes and someone who composes." But it is evident from the second page of her registration form that she is not simply taking *a* course in writing or in music, *or a* teacher. She specifies precisely what it is she is doing, with the air of making a contract. Under no circumstances is this adventure for its own sake—it is for the sake of an artist. She lists her work as follows:

1. Painting—my major interest.
2. Observation and Writing.
Observation and Art—participation in the reading and discussion.
3. Development of Music—an attempt to understand the differences and likenesses of music and painting.

Having this clear set of specifications, Hortense proceeds diligently to carry them out. Her academic reports are variations on a theme of praise for industry, effort, steadiness, progress, and, in her major field, talent, right through the year. A report to the Committee on Student Work in December quotes her faculty as agreed that "there is nothing to worry about in Hortense's case . . . her type of progress

had been more than adequate." The ratings are moderate to good ability in music, with a slightly higher achievement in the middle and at the end of the year. In writing her ability is moderate to good, while her achievement rating rises from moderate at the first of the year to good and better than good at the end. In painting the ratings are, throughout the year, excellent. The June reports summarize the qualities shown through the year very well:

DEVELOPMENT OF MUSIC.—Her work has been very satisfactory. The chief aim of the course was to give her some insight into musical composition and this has been achieved through analysis. As design is of paramount importance in drawing and painting, she is now fully aware of its place in music. She wrote an interesting paper on a Mozart Concerto, which showed how much she was thinking along these lines.

DRAWING AND PAINTING.—This student not only maintained the high level of work of former years but succeeded in producing a few pictures which are doubtless above college achievement in this field of study. She is also able to learn from other works of art, and tolerance toward other opinions and points of view is not diffusing the values she recognized in order to pursue her own work. Her ability, artistic intelligence, personal integrity, and energy to work constantly, made her one of the most excellent students I have ever met.

OBSERVATION AND WRITING.—Written work: In evaluating Hortense's work in writing, it should be remembered that her primary gifts and interests lie in the field of painting. Her talents and insights are closely related to the fine qualities of her visual imagination. Her aesthetic sensitivities are such that she almost never does a piece that is "middling good." It either fails utterly because she has been totally unable to translate visual perception into the written word (whenever she is uncertain of her ground, whenever the effort to "translate" becomes too large a problem for her to solve, her spelling and even the structure of her sentences tend to fall far below any "average"); or it runs beyond any "average" standard for written work. Many of her mechanical flaws tend to disappear, and the entire piece of writing, in all its details, is as mature as any instructor of fourth-year college work could desire. Her individual progress in this course has been unusually gratifying. She has turned in work with unceasing regularity, and if its progress has seemed erratic, the final picture of it shows a

proper curve upward in the ability to say precisely what she means.

The principle of "guidance" or program planning followed in the case of this talented but limited student is thus remarkably justified by the results—at least in terms of academic reports. At the end of freshman year there seemed no hope whatever of persuading Hortense to do more than perfunctory work in any area but art. A stronger requirement with disciplinary pressure applied would have produced undoubtedly more of what occurred in the freshman courses in literature and child psychology. The hope of teaching her to write even under a high-pressure requirement appeared to have no foundation at all. She was not a disciplinary problem; hers was a problem of ability to learn. Giving her all the rope she wanted to follow her own driving interest in art led after two years to a genuine curiosity about the creative aspects of literature and music and did produce through eight months of hard work on her own volition an ability to say what she wanted to say in perhaps more than adequate English writing. It also resulted in the acquisition of considerable acquaintance with musical literature and a capacity to understand, if not to enjoy for its own sake, the experience of music. She had acquired beyond this a considerable knowledge of elementary physics and had learned to take pleasure from the simpler processes of mathematical thought. She had learned, in short, four languages other than that of painting, her earliest choice: mathematics, physics, music and English, which though she had spoken it since birth she could by no means be said to have mastered before.

A number of things stand out as particularly interesting about her experience with music. Very early in the term, her teacher noticed her capacity to see design or form in the music she listened to. Although himself disinclined to press analogies between music and painting very far, he encouraged her to follow her interest in this direction. Early in the year when the class was concluding a study of the Bee-

thoven "Ninth" he allowed Hortense to take over the class for a talk about art. She was able to illustrate certain similarities in the use of an "all over pattern" between a Brueghel painting and the symphony. She went on to discuss art more generally and turned to modernists and abstractionists and the use of "thematic material" in painting. After the class she insisted that her teacher come up to the studio with her, and there showed him in several paintings what she believed was the direct influence of the study of certain musical compositions.

During the year, her two striking pieces of work consisted of a paper attacking Brahms and a paper analyzing certain of Mozart's works for which she had developed a strong enthusiasm. The study of Brahms had given her "a disgust" for what she called the "lush Victorian quality of 19th Century romantic music"; while the study of Mozart extended her genuine understanding and appreciation of formal relationships in musical composition.

In the case of Mozart and other eighteenth-century composers there was no doubt that her enjoyment was immediate and genuine. She learned to hear a piece of music as a whole. The development of her ear, her ability to listen, was striking, though she never attained great subtlety of perception or very thorough analysis. There were moments, however, when the instructor thought he observed her going beyond her purpose of the comparison of one art with another. In two or three performances of the chorus she was observed to "let go" and sing with what appeared to be not only free but tremendous vitality. "She is a surprising girl," says the instructor, concluding a confidential interview, "who wears a mask and takes it off in music occasionally."

In Hortense's experience with music and with writing we have very clear evidence of her intrepid but only half-conscious desire to integrate her knowledge. Not only is her intention in regard to music and writing focused upon their relation to painting, but the work done the year before in the

history of art is transferred to the paper on Brahms. In her course in the history of art she had become convinced that there were distinctions to be made in the approach to the understanding and enjoyment of art. She had learned something about the difference between objective understanding and subjective enjoyment; she had also begun to comprehend what historical study meant.

Along with the actual work in writing went assigned readings in a wide variety of modern authors including a number of poets. It was possible for Hortense, because of the approach through problems concerned with the creative art of fiction, to read as she had not done before. By this time she had developed quite sophisticated powers of insight and analysis in respect to paintings. For several years she had been going to exhibits of painting in New York and discussing these with members of the art faculty or turning in reports on them. She was able now, as she had not been before, to transfer this appreciative and critical activity to reading stories or novels or poems just because she was concerned with them as pieces of creative art.

When asked about her reading, the teacher doubted if she read for the pleasure of the book itself. In other words her experience in literature was somewhat analogous to her experience in music—she did not achieve the enjoyment of music entirely in its own terms and a comparison with painting was always in mind. But in literature her experience went one step further. She was writing sensitively—for this very reason her critical analysis of the work of others in the class and of assigned reading was active and aesthetic and in the terms of the art itself, because she was practicing it.

One would not like to make too much of this point, based as it is solely upon reference to this rather specialized and talented girl. However, it is perhaps important to point out that Hortense had, without knowing why, resisted all through her education the demand that she read, appreciate, learn, analyze, when she remained in a passive position in relation

to the material or the field, that is, in the position of the academic as traditionally understood. She would not and could not absorb; she could not passively enjoy except as the material or the subject was related to an area in which she herself became an active maker, doer, or creative worker. In this respect she may be a symbol of a good many other students whose capacity to learn is in varying degrees limited in just this sense and who, therefore, because this is not understood, are unable to progress under the usual academic routine or flourish in the usual academic atmosphere, where analysis has little direct relation to action, or to creating, but is left to be judged in its own logical terms: where words are more important than behavior, where seeing is more significant than making.

Certainly, in the following account of what this student does with the reading of Kafka's novels—her unconscious use of technique and fantasy—is undoubtedly aesthetic, involving both analysis and comprehension; but it is very unacademic, indeed.

In reviewing Hortense's work I believe a good deal of it was half-formulated in her imagination and experience before she entered the course, that (educationally speaking) her work this year was a cumulative result of the three years preceding it; that her chief problem, so far as writing was concerned, was a problem of translating whatever she had felt, said, or thought in painting into an unfamiliar medium, the written word.

Her earliest pieces written for my course showed two directly literary influences: 1) a student who was in my course last year, and whom Hortense had known well, had admired, and only recently has felt herself fit to criticize, 2) Franz Kafka, an influence probably acquired through hearing a teacher speak of him, perhaps with the knowledge that I also admired his work, and because she could attempt to disguise naked autobiographical material by using Kafka's mannerisms, such as the capital initial letter followed by a dash for names of persons and places and because through imitation she could also satisfy, with some immediacy and readily, her consistent demand for aesthetic form. Perhaps another reason why she admired Kafka was the semiconscious

identification of herself with an "outsider," a "victim" of stupid, unaesthetic people, a writer who was a true artist and who was misunderstood during his lifetime and is still misinterpreted, and, as far as the general public is concerned, is still "foreign" and unknown, whose work, in all respects, must be translated to be read and who was possessed by an overwhelming sense of guilt.

Her early pieces were literally like translations; as though she were in fact a "foreigner," and even at the year's end, whenever she became unsure of her ground, the number of misspellings and short, unidiomatic sentences visibly increased.

Another important factor in her written work was, of course, an obvious lack of training. Her imagination is predominantly visual and will probably remain so; therefore her attempts in the direction of phonetic spelling were unusually inept. I gave her a brief lecture (a mere outline) on the sources of the English language, reminding her that she must never attempt to write without a dictionary at hand—and to memorize the visual outlines of words.

During the year she developed three kinds of writing: the technical, somewhat "abstract" statement of an aesthetic problem, and two kinds of fables, one in a realistic setting, growing out of her early imitations of the student mentioned, written with the surface of harsh, middle-western speech; the other, a setting of scenes in imaginative reality in which children were characters: boys building a kite, flying off into air upon it, seeing the familiar world vanish into the great distance below them; children building a sand castle on a beach and then wilfully destroying it with great delight, so as to free themselves to play another game, completing a "perfect" or "happy" day; and children riding in a stage-coach through sun and rain, on and on, timelessly, a story without beginning and without end. The "realistic" stories contained in some instances, the inner problem of differences between sculpture and painting, their equal values and points of view debated (in one case) by a translation of the problem into the conduct of two women at an afternoon tea. The translation, of course, was not complete, yet the story as a story remained interesting. There was another story of a family quarrel, in which a girl was told to act like her grandmother by her mother, and both mother and daughter end at complete cross-purposes.

The most successful story of the lot was that of the sand castle and it was a story fit (almost) to set beside some few of Hortense's canvases. As far as the opinion of her classmates may be taken

as a standard, the stagecoach story and the story of the boys building a kite were "most readily remembered, and most clearly characteristic" of her work.

Concerning the several aspects of her educational development—her prejudice, her attitude toward her contemporaries and social life, her attitude toward her family, the emotional depth of her work in art, and the seriousness of her professional aims—the confidential interviews with her teachers at the end of her fourth year add little new information. She is by no means so ostentatiously prejudiced as she was the first year, though it must be said that her taste in painting and music is clear-cut and not without strong intolerances. It has a good deal to do with the quality of "restraint" or "moderation" which she admires and which has direct relation to her own need for control. For example, she considers German expressionism "wild"; she would call El Greco "wild"; she dislikes any kind of obscurity and she can make allowances for extreme vitality, as in the case of Rubens, because of the clarity of form. She actually defends Rubens against an attack by the class who were outraged by the fatness of his models. But these things apply to the area of fine art in which she is considerably sophisticated by this time and beyond the usual level of likes and dislikes. In the social area she is still somewhat the snob. She says in her senior interview on college matters that she would not be in favor of a greater variety of types of girls in the college; it would destroy any unity of spirit. Her political and economic opinions, if indeed she had any, are not recorded, but there is nothing to indicate that she had changed her "conventional" point of view. During her last year, however, Hortense was better liked by students and her work in the studio led to an enlargement of her circle of friends. But her close relations were always with girls from conventional homes. One of these reported that Hortense was also getting along better with boys.

The basic conflict between her acceptance of her family's social ambitions and prejudices and her desire to be independent, an artist with a studio in New York, was partly resolved by the compromise of a studio at home which also permitted her the frank satisfaction of Junior League activity. Rationally she is "above all that"; emotionally, only at times does she achieve independence from it.

From an interview which at this time was given all seniors on leaving college, the following questions and answers are quoted.

Questioner: "What do you think about the criticism that has been made that the education here makes people unwilling to go back and live in the communities their families are in? Do you think that is true?"

Hortense: "Well, personally I am not too joyous about going back to —. I think several people feel that."

Questioner: "Do you think that is the result of the kind of thing you have gotten here?"

Hortense, after a pause: "For me the whole thing started before I came to college. Maybe it has been brought out here. I think I know a little more why and have some ideas of what to do about it."

Questioner: "That you did not have before you came? So that, even though you do not want to return at all, the college has given you a sense of direction so that you know what you can do."

Hortense: "Yes."

Questioner: "Out of your college course, what has given you your sense of direction?"

Hortense: "Finding out what I want and the things I can choose from; the things I take. Perhaps my decision between painting and sculpture brought that home."

Thus, in spite of the career ideal, there appears to be a genuine acceptance of the world she was brought up in, somewhat concealed from herself by the dramatized conflict with her father about freedom to go to New York and have her studio. From things said, and as reported by different faculty, she seems to be more anxious to have her father's

recognition of her supreme merit as a painter in the form of saying "Of course have your studio in New York," than she is to leave the actual compromise with her present environment. This characteristically reflects the double attitude toward authority which runs through Hortense's record: she always submits to all rules; but she verbally protests authority and makes a great deal of stir about independence. She achieves genuine independence (if at all) only in her work in painting and after a long period of praise, criticism, recognition and more encouragement; after gaining proof after proof from her instructor that she is an artist.

This raises the question of educational evaluation of her work itself: How real is it? and what really is her relationship to it? One must take account here of two interviews with her painting teacher which were requested precisely for the purpose of clarifying the question of her relation to her work. In one of these interviews the instructor describes Hortense's behavior with color and line in painting:

I think the color quality of such a talented girl—the color ability, this inborn fact—is a thing you cannot learn and cannot teach. There is a quality of tonality in her colors which has nothing to do with right or wrong. This is, in her case, violently there. She herself tries to moderate it and restrain it, to calm it down. Whenever one asks me whether she has taste, well, if it is a sense of moderation that is meant, in connection with her powerful natural talent—then, she has taste. (She comes from a background of no taste whatever.)

This moderation is her ability and it makes people think she is rather cold. I think she is very sensitive. Her taste moderates things right away.

In respect to line—to divide and proportion things—she is calculating, figuring out all the time.

Sometimes she does this with conscious rationality; never in color, only in line; and then sometimes comes up what I call her funny sense of humor—which is not real humor, not wit, but a very thin arabesque. The detail is amusing, the detail of something which is very serious, which she takes seriously herself. She

is very serious. When she lets herself go in painting she loves to turn that serious thing into some amusing arabesque which, in spite of all—is serious. She only wants to give the amusing surface.

A little further in the conversation the instructor describes how Hortense characteristically works.

She starts with an emotional drive from something visual or from memory. This emotion is rather vague. While she is working and developing the thing she parts from her emotion and the outcome may have very little to do with the original idea. It is an entirely different thing sometimes which surprises herself.

Just to make this more clear, let me say she wants to paint a picture which is a spring day. She starts with that very emotionally, and while she works she gets other ideas and the whole story changes and the result she calls "Saturday Afternoon." It has content, it has meaning; only she has gone another way. She does not go directly toward her original idea.

Her chief difficulty is that because of her manual ability there is unity which is reached too fast. I would say that this might indicate too great a need for unity.

The instructor pointed out that there was absolutely no doubt that Hortense enjoyed painting and he also remarked, in passing, that she had appeared really to enjoy the writing she did the last year, which he did not believe was done in the least to please the teacher. He also felt that Hortense developed a genuine independent professional seriousness during the last year. Her technical gain was extraordinary, her rapidity with work at times almost breath-taking. He alluded to his academic report which stated that she was one of the best students he had ever taught.

And yet he could not deny that there seemed to him a fundamental emptiness in the relation of her work to herself. It was herself perhaps, but there was no core there; it was a hollow. His way of expressing this was, "She will never (because she *can* never) go to pieces, as many artists must do, once, twice, just for a moment in their lives—that is it: she will never die—no, not even for one moment." But this,

he went on to explain did not mean she was not sensitive, nor that her devotion to and pleasure in art were insincere. That was not true. In spite of the strong opposition of her family, she had chosen to buy a Paul Klee painting and one of the instructor's paintings with her own money, instead of a ring or some other rare but conventional thing. This was evidence enough of strong devotion to painting. The even more amazing fact about this determined and careful selection of two paintings was that the two paintings bought were perhaps the most ethereal among those she had the chance to select from; they also seemed to the instructor to have the least psychological implications in quality. Her preference was entirely and unquestionably hers. He considered it truly representative of her taste.

Summary

The study of Hortense is important because it illustrates many characteristics of students of limited general ability, who nevertheless achieve a qualified success; energy, plus a specific talent and an incentive which impel toward growth in use of the talent. Values that made emotional depth impossible prevented a complete fulfillment of Hortense's talent; in this respect a contrast might be made between her career and that of another student of similar patterns of ability (limited general intelligence plus artistic gifts) who showed a happier development because her artistic ability was supported by stronger emotional vitality, response to people, and concern with human problems. Hortense is one example of the "rigid personality" discussed by Munroe¹ and mentioned briefly in this book (pp. 130 f.).

Her story also illustrates the way in which needed development in another area (writing) may come more easily after achievement of considerable maturity in a major field, a point extremely important in relation to curriculum planning for individual students.

¹ Ruth L. Munroe, *Teaching the Individual* (New York, 1942).

TEST RECORD FOR HORTENSE

PRE-COLLEGE RECORD

Name of Test

Terman Group A: IQ, 113 (CA 12-3, MA 13-10)

Shank IIIc Silent Reading CA 16-2: Score 59 (Reading Age 16-2)

COLLEGE RECORD

American Council on Education

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
Completion	35	Analogies	46
Arithmetic	21	Opposites	4
Artificial Language	23	Gross Score	14

Bernreuter Personality Inventory

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
B1-N	2	B4-D	62
B2-S	46	F1-C	10
B3-1	1	F2-S	3

Allport-Vernon Values Study (scores from 31 to 28 are average)

	<i>Score</i>		<i>Score</i>
Theoretical	35	Social	27½
Economics	28	Political	33½
Aesthetic	30	Religious	26

Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Women

Nurse	C+	Lawyer	C
Housewife	B-	Physician	C+
Social Worker	C-	Librarian	B
Secretary-Stenographer	B-	Artist	A
Teacher in general	C+	Author	B

AMBIVALENCE RESULTING FROM EARLY SHOCK: LOUISE

LOUISE was the kind of student to stir faculty interest. Rather stocky and vivacious, she was intellectually alert, walked with a swagger and often talked with a challenge. She had a flair for catching the outlines of a teacher's point of view almost at the very start, and, either through leading questions or through an occasional impertinence drew the teacher out further. Almost from the beginning she was active in student affairs on the campus, and she was in the center of discussion in almost any class. Students who had very little association with her knew her because of her work in dramatics or her activity in sports. Yet Louise never became the best of athletes, the best of actresses, nor did she come to fulfillment as a mature creative student with unquestioned command of some one field.

Why not? The question led to discussion and even to worry by some of those faculty who were especially interested in student guidance. Was it not a fault of the college? Should we not be able to do more for a student so potentially powerful; could we not shape her more perfectly toward the qualities or traits she should have? The story told here is by no means the whole story, nor by any means the story of Louise from her own point of view; it is rather the story of the appearance and reappearance of these disturbing questions among faculty who were responsible for her college status. Some of these questions are implicit in the following report:

January 19, 1937. In spite of her apparently happy-go-lucky attitude, this student is under considerable emotional tension (which results in some confusion) as to whether to resist or submit to authority.

Her mental equipment is adequate for perfectly decent college

work, though she is not in any sense brilliant. She is full of curiosity and willingness to learn, but somewhat resistant towards assimilating facts and ideas into her own personality.

In case of difficulty, the "kidding" approach works very well with her, and she will accept the authoritarian attitude on the part of someone whom she feels to be on her side.

Her present desire to learn everything all at once is to some extent due to a desperate feeling that this year of college is all that she will have. (She may be wrong in assuming that her father will not allow her to return.)

Taking everything into consideration, she is doing remarkably well. She needs help in thinking things through, and will profit by the experience of the thorough completion of small tasks. She should be urged to do more written work, to which she is resistant because, as she admits, writing things down makes her see how little she knows about them. At the same time, it is important not to block her by too much insistence on her confusions.

This report was written by her adviser some four months after Louise entered college. It brought the girl to the attention of a small faculty group making a special study of attitudes toward authority among normal college students. After discussion following a report by a member of this group, certain conclusions were tentatively reached concerning the general procedure to be followed.

One of the points made was the appearance of contradictions in Louise's registration interviews with faculty. Usually these brief interviews, although they give only a superficial picture of the student, do outline the direction of interests or offer evidence that there are none. In Louise's case the outline of interests is not clear, although the picture of the girl herself is fairly vivid in spite of the very different impressions. In her application form she had listed her choice of subjects in college as economics, politics, history, literature and possibly voice, dramatics, and oratory; she had added to these journalism and publications. She mentioned all of these in the interviews during the first day of registration.

A member of the music faculty to whom she was sent for an initial interview reported;

She grasps eagerly all new suggestions, and appears always anxious to be trusted. I think we mentioned every course to be offered this year. She speaks quickly, nervously, and without thinking. I wonder how long it will take for her to find her true interests?

The report from the dramatics teacher on the same afternoon is an interesting comparison:

Easy in conversation although she says she lacks confidence. Her most definite interest at the time seems to be in politics and advertising. . . . She has studied some psychology and doesn't want to continue with the subject right away. I asked her about her interest in art and suggested that she see two teachers about their courses and she tells me she is "crazy" about the theatre, but has never been allowed to participate because she was "never good enough." She wonders if she will be good enough to work here. I cannot tell whether this is a real interest or not and asked her not to make up her mind immediately about it, but if, after seeing other instructors and considering other possibilities, she really wants to increase her understanding of the theatre, not to let the fear of her own lack of success keep her from electing the work. I cannot tell whether her hesitancy in general arises from its being a superficial interest, a real feeling of inadequacy or the desire only to attempt what she knows she will succeed in.

Louise's interview with another teacher not more than an hour later reveals that either she handled each teacher with a somewhat different technique, or that she adapted herself rapidly to the interview situation on the first day.

Louise is a very jolly, unself-conscious person with a great deal of enthusiasm. She is eager to add new fields to her experience. Last year she had special training in Politics, and now assumes that she knows all there is to know. Her main interest is Politics and Social Science, but she thinks that it would be better for her to try something in Art and Literature. She is resistant to suggestion of one instructor that she try to work in Dramatics. She was receptive to my suggestion that she might take something in Social Science to check and add to what she had been able to discover in a foreign country.

In journalism Louise was more expansive:

She has liked and likes Economics and Politics—American and European. She likes Dramatics but is afraid she would not be good—would like to write well and simply but isn't sure she can

learn to. Interested in advertising and the executive end of a newspaper—she wants to work after college because “it makes you more interesting to yourself and to other people.”

I found her exceptionally original, humorous, intelligent and aware. She has a stimulating presence. You think of her as very young in spite of her keen mind—and perhaps that is due to a certain lack of self-confidence you come upon to your surprise. She is, I believe, 19, but looks younger. This sense of inferiority cropped up when she had finally decided to take reporting—“I’ll probably be terrible— Maybe I can’t learn to write,” etc.

She wants very much to work in Politics later and would probably be good at it. She told me that she wanted to go to Teachers College or Columbia because social sciences are so good there, but that her father thought she had too many radical ideas and might gain more there. He let her choose between Bennington and Sarah Lawrence College. “But I haven’t any radical ideas, really,” she hastened to add and it was apparent that she had no defined ideas that could be called radical— Also, she wore a Landon button. She said that last year she wrote a paper on Propaganda and the Press.

She is almost too receptive to suggestion and might easily spread out her interests too much.

The next day Louise announced that she had decided to register for an introductory economics course and to follow this in the second term with introduction to politics. She had also decided to take a course in literature and had definitely made up her mind to take dramatics. The teacher pointed out that her interest in advertising was not taken care of and suggested a possible substitute for dramatics in a course which dealt with plays, dance, music, and art forms.

The following day it was reported at a meeting of Registration Advisers that Louise had chosen a program comprising journalism, social problems through literature, and economics. The consensus of opinion was that the program was unbalanced and contained none of the courses specially designed for freshmen. A reconsideration was requested and Louise finally enrolled for a course in literature for freshmen; journalism, and economics. By the middle of the year, she had dropped journalism as a course but continued to work

on the campus paper, and substituted a course in the appreciation of music, adding politics as a fourth course.

Her energy appeared inexhaustible. The medical report mentions her as a very buoyant, overactive girl, in spite of low blood pressure and lack of sleep, chronic sinusitis, allergy, and hoarseness, to say nothing of irregular and painful menstrual periods. About all this there appeared very little to do, though numerous advices, interviews with physicians were arranged, and some medication was offered. Louise would turn up at the infirmary, listen to instructions, and do almost nothing about them.

The preliminary academic reports in November praised her industry and interest, and regarded her as potential material for the A.B. By December, however, qualifications had crept in: she was "excellent in group discussion and cooperative in conference," but "needed to increase the quantity and quality of her written work." After commenting on her industry in economics and her real intellectual curiosity this teacher said, "in her impatient desire to learn everything at once she will need to guard against spreading herself thin. She needs to work more slowly, taking time to find and weigh all relevant evidence on a given subject before reaching even a tentative conclusion." A third teacher is "sometimes disappointed in her ability to follow through" in the work concerned with newspaper management, and questions "whether her abilities are not being deployed on too many subjects," even though she is a "superior student, a willing, intrepid and energetic worker." Her "news sense" is praised, together with interest, imagination in interviewing people, "but her writing is not as good as her reporting and yet better than she thinks it is." She needs practice, but there are so many other things that Louise is anxious to know and to do in which the teacher also is interested that the practice in writing is likely to be sacrificed. Hence Louise is urged to choose what things she wants most and to specialize in them.

These reports are the basis for the adviser's remarks quoted

at the beginning of this story. They stimulated the small group of teachers to an attempt at a better understanding and the discovery of possible reasons both for the extreme energy and for the tendency toward superficiality. Information was drawn from pre-college records, various test ratings, and material relating to her background and her behavior in the freshmen literature course, where a running record was kept in some detail.

Louise's marks from an excellent private boardingschool range from D to A with an average of C plus to B. She was characterized as "full of life and spirits, impulsive, honorable, warm-hearted, full of initiative, considerable executive ability, well-liked, . . . fine sense of values, industrious, but not up to level of her endowments; athletic, fond of music and poetry, wide interests." Louise herself said that her favorite subjects in secondary school were history and (in the last year) psychology. Of the latter she remarks, "Fascinating, because it made me see the order and development of a human being who was before a mystifying creature. It made me lose my stupid fear and realize that the things I did and felt were not peculiar to myself."

The American Council Test rating put Louise in the 56th percentile which more or less corresponded to the rating of the Admissions Committee of the college, though in the college rating she came toward the top of the middle group of students. The Allport-Vernon Values scores were all average, none very high or low. The Strong Vocational interest ratings gave her A as a high-school teacher of social sciences; B plus as a teacher, housewife, office worker, Y.W.C.A. secretary, or high-school teacher of English; and B as a secretary-stenographer. On the whole, this information is about what one might expect from looking over her school records and her application form, although the American Council Rating appeared a little below the qualitative estimates of her intelligence by the schools.

The Bernreuter Personality Test, however, offered rather

striking scores in certain respects: it showed that "as compared to the persons on whom the test was standardized Louise was more neurotic than 94 percent, more self-sufficient than 32 percent, more introverted than 91 percent, more dominant than 18 percent, more self-confident than 14 percent, more sociable than 45 percent. Judged by faculty observations, the neurotic and introverted ratings on the Bernreuter test were extreme, to say the least, but as both terms were highly controversial as to meaning, the discrepancy was not considered surprising, although it did stimulate the curiosity of her teachers.

What information could be gathered concerning the girl's family and general background was summarized by a member of the small research group as follows:

Louise was nearly nineteen when she entered Sarah Lawrence College. She is the youngest of seven children; the older six include twin boys eight years older than Louise, and four girls nine to thirteen years older than Louise. "I was one of those little surprises," Louise says, "who came along after they had moved the dogs into the nursery." Her father is a broker with a high school education, supplemented by private tutoring. Louise's mother came from a New York City family. She was educated at a private school.

Louise's mother died when Louise was seven. Her father married again and Louise makes her home with him.

I gather from Louise (and only from her) that her father is rather inclined to feel himself burdened with a lot of useless children, and to regard his youngest child both as an ugly duckling and as one who may yet be saved from being useless. His definition of usefulness is not available, but it seems to include complete agreement with him (called "knowing how to think") and making some money.

Her adviser reported: "There is considerable tension between her and her father; as she puts it, 'I like my father, and I admire his intellect, but we always fight when we are together.' She has also mentioned a certain amount of disagreement with one older sister who is apparently inclined to criticize Louise rather harshly."

After meeting Louise's father her adviser reported that in discussing her college work . . . he had a good deal to say about wanting her to learn how to think because in that case she would of course come to accept his point of view. She had said to me that his attitude toward her could be summed up by "When you're older and get some sense, you will know better." He also expressed his fear of her adding to her radical ideas.

The adviser added that Louise had said that her father

insists that she learn how to earn her living—though apparently there is no need for her to do so. This attitude on his part Louise seems to take seriously, and she tends to consider her courses at college in the light of preparation for some kind of job. This is not the whole of her attitude toward her work, for she has an active and inquiring mind, but it is a strong factor.

Louise appeared to have many acquaintances on the campus. She frequently complained that "girls don't take me seriously because I am always clowning. . . . I know it is my fault," she said, "but I just can't help it." She belonged to numerous campus clubs. Her references to boys were always made in the most casual way and there appeared no trace of a feeling on her part that she was unpopular or unsuccessful in her relationship with them. Her absence record up to the middle of the first year indicates a normal social activity; she went to several men's colleges on week ends; she had five evenings at the theatre and as many independent field trips on her own initiative.

Her economics instructor emphasized the girl's eagerness to acquire a great deal of knowledge and her apparent difficulty with writing. Her publications teacher said: "She is going through considerable mental readjustment these days, veering now to the liberal and now to the conservative side of questions, but she appears to be taking the problem in her stride, laughing while she worries." Her adviser added:

Her grasp of subject matter is usually good as far as it goes, but she is not so much interested in subject matter as in its implications and relationships. Whatever she reads she relates to

her own experiences and opinions, sometimes very shrewdly. It is in this area that I have laid the emphasis in our conference discussions. Louise is a double-barreled sort of person; she has a yes and a no for almost everything. At first, she talked a great deal about how she "saw both sides" of everything—which was true in a limited sense only. Now she has a pretty good working grasp of the fact that she is not so much liberal as puzzled; that it is her way of working to be on both sides and on neither. She is still rebellious against accepting this as just as good a way to be as any, for she says she dislikes the idea of being "wishy-washy."

I am hoping for the emergence of a real and deep interest of some kind—any kind; the sort of interest with which she can really identify herself wholeheartedly. Perhaps that is impossible.

Her manner or behavior was also by this time quite recognizable; it was consistently inconsistent or opposite. She would be down one moment and up another. She would come in accusing herself rather abjectly and suddenly shift to flashing impertinence or a detached verbal clowning. She would be able to evoke from the same instructor different impressions on different days, just as she had done in the registration interviews. At times her manner was reported as a curious combination of "hail-fellow-well-met" and deference; both "Hi there, and yes sir!" As one teacher put it, she walked and acted more like a boy than a girl, but added that this was much too strong a statement and it would be more accurate to say that she sometimes gave an impression of boyishness, but was actually very feminine indeed.

A similar double attitude characterized Louise's participation in class discussion; she would be alert and "frequently a little ahead of the speaker," keen-eyed and serious, but in making her point, the seriousness would be covered by a manner often so comic as to draw laughter from the group and herself. She once told her adviser that she never felt that a person liked her unless he took her seriously, yet she seemed always to prevent this by adorning "a serious remark with a deprecatory touch of comedy as if she were afraid of being laughed at and wanted to beat the other person to it."

ideal, nobody should, indeed, reach it, because she is afraid of another terrible blow if she attaches herself too closely.

At the same time there is the initial state of will to force herself back into the unity and to recapture what has been taken away from her.

Her work is greatly influenced by her changing moods. But, together with the last phase—the effort to pull herself together, to be a whole, a unit again—she is developing a will for insight and good achievements. She has many and rich gifts, is clever and spontaneous, and it is important that she is helped in concentrating herself and reaching genuine interest in some task. Here seems to be a fruitful starting point for pedagogic help: to get her away from her traumatic shock and to widen her outlook, to make her stronger and more independent.

After considerable discussion of all the material and a report by one member of the group, several conclusions about Louise's relations to teachers and learning were tentatively reached. These were:

1. That Louise's attitude toward persons in authority was ambivalent; apparently wishing both to submit to it and to resent or refuse to submit.
2. That the form of this ambivalence was sometimes expressed by a double manner which took the form of keeping rules, but at the same time treating the person in authority as if she were on the same level of authority herself—i.e., an unconscious denial, for herself, that the authority existed.
3. That with this ambivalence toward authority ran also a strong sense of uncertainty or feeling of inferiority about what she could do, so that she might suddenly feel doubts about anything which she had taken on as a responsibility.
4. That this continual conflict often forced her to seek in intellectual areas that perfect sort of authority or right answer which would at once satisfy her and give her confidence by the possession of it or the identification with it. But because these intellectual areas were associated with teachers and personal points of view and were in conflict she was inevitably ever seeking and shifting; perceiving their inadequacy; or balancing one against another.
5. That the causes or sources of these conflicts in her character must be left to surmise because of lack of specific information. It was held as probable, however, that they had something to

do with the death of her mother and the emotional insufficiency of her relation with whatever substitutes followed her mother as responsible for her. One reason for such probable surmise was found to lie in certain reactions to books and certain references to early life which had given her literature teacher the impression that she held unconsciously a picture of her early childhood as a "lost paradise."

6. That this divided state of her emotional life accounts for her inability to get too close to anyone or anything, and hence for the impression of superficiality which her faculty report.
7. It is an open question whether she can or will find a deep or permanent interest; whether this scattered or superficial use of her energies will or can be changed by relations with teachers or by encouragement and increasingly disciplined achievement.
8. It was agreed that the occasional use of external authority for this student was probably better than the implicit demand that she entirely direct her own energies; but that consistent and ubiquitous use of severe authority would be bad in that it would give her no real opportunity to understand her own tendencies. Authority from teachers should be used as a help to her, rather than as a disciplinary condition, and efforts should be made to allow her independence, and a variety of choice beyond that of many students.

It was pointed out that from a common-sense social point of view Louise could be considered quite normal and even more effective than many, but that from the point of view of her potentialities as an individual in our society she was actually lacking in opportunities for development. She could not fully use her abilities to learn.

The faculty group discussed Louise's needs with a psychiatrist who agreed that a serious traumatic shock in her early history had left her with a deep and unsatisfied attitude of dependence. She needed to move away from this shock through a widening of outlook. By a process of encouragement and gradual small successes it might be possible to supplant the unconscious attitude of dependence by one of assurance based on a series of small but certain achievements. Furthermore, the conflict from which the girl suffered often

produced the type of person described as masochistic. Louise, however, possessed a certain security enabling her to avoid the neurosis that might have been expected to occur. Tendencies toward the role of a martyr are slight but definite; for example, her allusions to having been evidently an unwanted child. Counterforces of security arise from the fact that she did have a "paradise" of early childhood; that her social position is secure; that, although authority is not satisfying or simple for her, it has actually allowed her fairly satisfactory compromises.

Louise's adviser knew of these conclusions, however tentative, but only one of her other teachers had taken part in the special group study, which was at that time in an experimental stage and was not discussed with the faculty as a whole.

The reports at the end of the first year were not as good as at the beginning. The teachers of the freshman reading course and of economics both complimented Louise on good work; apparently she showed greater consistency of effort in these courses than in the others. The former complains that no effort has been made to improve in writing, and the latter says: "She needs to work for a fuller and more systematic presentation of ideas both orally and in writing. She needs practice in transcribing the symbols of her intellectual shorthand into full-length exposition and analysis." Both teachers cite her as potential material for advanced work. There is no doubt of her sincere interest in all courses, with the possible exception of music; but it is clear that literature and social science have opened up problems the implications of which were very exciting to her.

In the autumn of her second year Louise registered for social philosophy, reading and writing, and dramatics; before Christmas she added anthropology to this schedule, already heavy in required reading. She was permitted to do so perhaps because the reading in anthropology was related to some of the social and philosophical problems in the social phi-

losophy course. The motives which led her to take these courses appear rather obvious. She had always hankered to work in the theatre and had been at the point of signing up for dramatics in her freshman year. By the beginning of her second year she found enough courage to do so. The course in reading and writing promised interesting possibilities in the study of modern authors, with steady conference work in expository and critical writing, which everybody had told her she needed. Social theory would almost certainly bring to a focus various points of view involved in social and economic discussions and relate these to broader considerations of a philosophical sort.

Her early autumn reports were again all good; that on writing was particularly encouraging.

This student was sure she could not write. She could think and feel (indeed very sharply and sensitively) but she could not write. She could not put words into sentences and sentences into paragraphs and paragraphs into units of related and effective thought. She could not type. Her first efforts illustrated this pathetic thesis quite well. There was, however, nothing stopping her from writing but her feeling. Her last papers have not only been writing, but clear, effective and interesting writing. Her paper on Lincoln Steffens, solid, acute and sensitive, is first-rate work.

She was now doing a great deal of reading, how thoroughly remains to be seen. In December her adviser wrote a confidential report:

Marked improvement in every way. She has still a great deal to learn about organizing the activities of a mind good enough for all academic purposes, and she is still unstable emotionally, swinging rapidly back and forth between self-distrust and bravado. But she is aware of her difficulties, and has been trying to overcome them. She needs encouragement, but appreciates it more if it comes from someone who is also capable of kicking her around a bit now and then when she needs it.

In January, Louise's work in four courses again causes some dissatisfaction; all but one of the teachers expected

more from her than she was doing—not in quantity, but in organized, serious, integrated thinking and achievement; two teachers refer again to her self-distrust. In clear contrast to these summaries is the report from dramatics which gives a very different picture:

The student works hard, intelligently and conscientiously, is capable of doing and does work of first-rate quality. She takes the initiative in forming her own program, undertakes and is accomplishing a great deal of work. . . . She has unusual ability to organize ideas and materials and to work with people.

In preparing the part the student not only developed the character during the rehearsal period but developed an ability to control and direct her own processes. She became more flexible emotionally, her rehearsal technique improved and her awareness of the problems involved in acting increased. Considering her inexperience, the performance was remarkable. Judged by any standards, it was sincere and moving.

I believe it takes real courage to undertake a part like this for a school audience, and I hope that the student's being able to do it means that she has the courage intrinsic in any art work, the courage to stand ridicule and misunderstanding. It will be interesting to see if she displays the same kind of courage in investigating and exploring the forces within herself which create patterns for her thinking and behavior. This exploration would be an important achievement for her.

After this, there seems to have been a growing sense of alarm or worry among her teachers. The reports the end of March bear witness to unevenness of effort and to wide variability in quality; her achievements are rated from slight to excellent, her development or gain from slight to marked; these ratings point to hesitancy or a certain indecision in estimating her work. Nevertheless, all reports use the term "good work," though two of them imply a clear demand for better work. In two courses she appears to be floundering about in search of some topic of interest. The work in writing has not led to sustained achievement of any kind whatever. Even in anthropology the conference work remains on the level of short projects of considerable variety, the only sign

of unity or continuity being given by the class assignments. Only in the dramatics workshop is there steady gain in the technique of acting and steady preparation of parts for various plays to be produced in the spring.

The adviser doubtless realized that the nature of her courses was not such as to give Louise opportunity for the suggested series of small achievements from which she could gain confidence. That her outlook was being broadened, that she was being carried out of herself, would certainly seem to be true. And yet the nature of the material studied was highly controversial. All this thinking gave her an excellent opportunity to swing from one side of the fence to the other; to move outward or deeply inward as the impulse might lead. Only the work in the theatre seemed to give definite and limited focus. But even here there is a scattering, a participation in four different enterprises during the late winter and early spring months.

By late spring her work appears to have been better than that of the preceding springs, however. In early April, Louise found definite projects in each of three courses. The project reading on Mexico for anthropology developed into a class report on Mayan civilization later judged as "excellent." The study of Freud in social theory seems to have suggested a project for the reading and writing course—a study of "Fantasies" in literature. In the dramatics activity, two specific parts, one for an Ibsen play and one for a Shaw play were studied and completed in performance in May and June. The work in social theory remained focused only in respect to the class assignments, which were increasingly specialized toward the end of the year. The teacher, however, noted that the conference discussions with Louise during this part of the year, and even earlier, centered on rather personal moral questions of concern to Louise, largely because she was continually under fire from the class because of her "moral attitudes." She neither drank nor smoked and she violently condemned unconventional sex attitudes. She was not warmly

loved by the members of this distinctly intellectual group of students, but her wit was such that she maintained their respect. A strong effort to pull herself together for specific academic achievements does not entirely change the temper of the final reports for social theory and the reading and writing. It does seem to have been effective in anthropology.

The year's work in the theatre seems to have been as successful, all round, as anyone could have wished. The two final paragraphs of the report, particularly the last sentence in the last paragraph, include a summary that no other report has given.

She has dealt with her work intelligently, displaying an unusual ability to organize materials and ideas. The parts she played have reflected a lively imagination and a keener insight into human material than the student knows she possesses. She needs to concentrate more in rehearsals and to learn to rely more on method and less on inspiration. Her voice has improved amazingly, or else she has always had hidden one which she has chosen to use only recently. Her participation in discussions has been vigorous and increasingly thoughtful, and she seems to be acquiring the ability to gather evidence objectively and follow where it leads her.

Her interest has been well sustained and she has worked hard throughout the year. She has real staying power and courage and has made stimulating contributions to the Activity.

If one considers the nature of these reports in relation to the initial theory of her character conflicts, several rather obvious points emerge. She is able to sustain a pace of work with greater assurance in anthropology, where the course is structured in a sharply schematic outline and where the material is objective and descriptive and of little immediate relevance to herself. In dramatics there is greater chance for emotional stress and strain, but the problems here are not concerned with ethical or philosophical theory and are not yet, at least, anchored to underlying attitudes toward life. The drift is definitely outward—toward the expression of feelings and situations that are not her own. Further, there is also structure in dramatics—that is, things must be done

at definite times. It is doubtful if the work in the theatre made very great demands upon consistent independence. But in writing and social theory, there was no dead line except the one she set herself; no audience to confuse or condemn her except her own conscience, abetted by the morally persuasive assumptions of her teachers that if she was not mature enough to find, entirely on her own, a sustained interest or a solid theme for a written opus, she should be, ought to be.

A question that cannot possibly be answered from the records is at this point very perplexing indeed: Did Louise herself feel she should be made into something else? Did she share, by virtue of the conscience which her teacher in social theory became aware of, the very underlying, purposive assumptions which her teachers tended to hold in regard to her?

In one respect athletics brought out the same problem raised in the discussion of dramatics. The theatre gave her a chance to be effective for short periods; gave her opportunity to organize her energies in an outward activity with a specific and effective achievement. Athletics did much the same. Her reputation here by the end of her four years was that she played brilliantly in sports; that she was uncertain but surprising. At this time the alternation had perhaps not become widely noticeable. She confessed to one teacher that she was afraid of almost every game and every sort of athletic contest, though as far as she knew no one knew it. The question was how long could such control continue? Was Louise possibly more complicated, more confused, more deeply tangled in inner conflicts, more the slave of inner fears than people realized? One teacher frankly asked: Would she not break under pressure?

For her third year Louise elected Thomas Mann, English and American poetry, and modern drama. The Student Work Committee criticized this unbalanced program and urged one factual social science course. The upshot of further discussions with her adviser was that Louise compromised with

the committee's refusal to allow a straight literary and dramatics program by registering for modern European history. She also agreed to considerable critical writing in line with the regular work in modern drama.

The compromise seemed a good one. The year was on the whole the most successful of her college career. If one may judge by the academic reports alone, the program held her interest and stimulated her to more organized effort than any other she had followed. For example, her work on Thomas Mann was consistently successful throughout the year; she tried "to arrive at a personal evaluation of the materials studied" and in her teacher's opinion succeeded. The conferences were battles over ideas, in which her instructor appeared to enjoy the challenges she brought and for which he urged her to prepare with more precision, for she fights with "inspired madness, not with exquisite art."

So, too, in modern drama, her teacher found the year one of consistent progress toward a deeper and more controlled critical point of view, with more regular written work. As Louise became more sharply critical, she also became more tolerant. The final report in history refers to her making "first-rate use of her abilities." Finally, in the theatre itself, her record is one of praise for successful effort and maintenance of "a high standard of work throughout the year." In short, her reports indicated that she had carried four courses through the year with a high average and was qualified for advanced college work. But this picture of the third year is not the whole picture. There was no sudden change in the character of her behavior. The variability, the sudden moods, the worries are still there; they appear through confidential sections of the reports and are implicit in the criticism given to supplement the record of good achievement.

Though Louise made a very energetic and popular president of one of the major college associations, there was continual difficulty during the year in coöperation. In several instances one hand of the department did not know what the

other hand did; not from any lack of willingness to coöperate, but as the result of the too rapid entrance of too much gusto or too many new ideas in a complicated administrative situation. Her impulsiveness was also apparent in certain early reports, with allusions to the need for "systematic analysis" and to an alternation in the quality of work, some of it dead, or imitative, some highly imaginative. In March, the other characteristic allusion: "You are taking the work too hard—i.e., . . . making it too much a part of your personal experience."

There is a good deal to be said for the theory that Louise, in spite of doing work well above the average for the year, spent a great deal of energy worrying her teachers into positions where they would "declare themselves." Perhaps the most dramatic example of this lies in the second report to the student from the dramatics activity.

You know by this time that you carry out any piece of work responsibly, capably and efficiently—don't argue—that your co-operative spirit—don't argue—is a valuable asset in group work and that because of it and your abilities you make a real contribution to group projects. Don't argue. You must know that as stage manager for your last play you worked hard and that you were particular in carrying out all details; that you sustained excellent morale among your helpers and the cast and that the result was a beautifully smooth running performance. Don't argue. You know, too, although you think I don't, that acting comes very easily to you—don't argue—so easily that you miss many of the by-products that emerge from a long, hard struggle with a part. Your uneasiness in preparing a part comes partly because you have a strong inclination to rely on your intuition and at the same time a strong inclination to distrust it. As a result of watching your work and listening to your comments in class and informal discussion, I have developed quite a respect for your intuition and would like in the next play to work out a method with you of making more use of it than you do now, without losing the benefit of your logic. . . .

What you don't know about yourself is that your contributions to class discussions and in group meetings do a great deal to keep the discussion focussed and moving and increase its value for the

group, also that you have an imagination of unusual quality and that it might be as important for you to develop that as to focus your energies on building up an entirely consistent, systematic reasonableness in yourself. Come in and argue!

At the end of the year the same instructor summarizes her criticism of Louise's work with the following ironical paragraph:

The student's relationship to this kind of work suffers from unresolved conflicts, from her constant effort to justify her interest and participation in it, not on the grounds of its educational value or its personal meaning to her, but in terms of a vocational course which will supply her with economic independence.

There is no doubt that the teacher had hit a new nail right on the head, or if the metaphor can be allowed, an old nail in a new form. Louise came to college with intentions of preparing herself for the diplomatic service, for social work, for —, at least for a vocation of considerable respectability. Now the theatre is a new possibility, but the respectability of the theatre was one question she would have to face, and another was her own ability for successful adventure in this calling. True, it might be particularly ironical to show her father that one could make good in a profession so calculated to astonish him. In fact, one could even go so far as to get him to college to see one of the best of one's performances; but would comparative success in college mean success in the hard-boiled backstages of Broadway? How could one tell? Her doubts may have risen from the recurrent streak of puritanism which remained with her through this year; that refusal to drink or smoke which a teacher noticed in the second year, that worry over ethical problems which her instructor in drama felt had been incited by too much attempt at reform, that persistent interest in philosophical, psychological, and particularly "moral" problems which another teacher reported in his confidential notes.

Her dramatics teacher felt certain that Louise would "awfully like to be convinced that the theatre was serious work,

that being on the stage was legitimate," but that she never attained that conviction. This showed up most in rehearsals where she could never completely sustain concentration; "she would always allow herself to be distracted by sudden comments or humor"; she seemed always to need "some kind of justification for showing off, for being an actress"; rehearsals did not give this sufficiently; performances seemed to furnish it, but unevenly. In short, there is a parallel between the double moral attitude of the girl (strong convictions mixed with tolerance of individuals who are condemned) and the double attitude toward the theatre—that is, her effort to overcome prejudice, but her incapacity completely to give herself to serious concentration on a role.

At the end of this third year, just at the time when the teachers were observing little or no change in the girl's ways of thinking and behavior, and at the time when one teacher noted the apparent acceptance of the fact that there is "no short cut to emotional security," her adviser wrote:

The main fact about this year's development is that it is a culmination of two processes evident from the start:

1. Increase in the body of facts at her disposal;
2. The better direction of an exuberant and vital spirit—more control without loss of speed. "Growing up" nicely covers it. There is a better grasp of fact, more careful consideration of evidence.

Concerning her "educational needs for the future in terms of curriculum and personal development" he says, "Her greatest need is for work which will help her to bring details into patterns, and to criticize the patterns by reference to fact and experience rather than emotion. Her program as planned seems good."

The adviser report form also asks for specific directions—changes to aim for, methods of work, skills to develop; ways of teaching this student; difficulties to watch for. He advises:

Specific directions: build up responsible critical documented thinking, without interfering with vivacity and whoosh!

Changes: in direction of more responsible thinking. To develop: critical attitude.

Ways of teaching: no problem here, she will take the lead.

Difficulties: jumping at conclusions, and landing on *both* sides of the fence. Tendency to do too much extra-curricular work.

The form Louise herself filled in for registration for the senior year called for a statement of the "direction of purpose" of her college work. Here she mentions dramatics first instead of last as in the report to her adviser. She says:

Work in Dramatics to help me in future relations with that field. Work in the social sciences and philosophy to prepare a ground for future teaching—my general work for three years to help me gain a little knowledge of myself and the world I'll live in. [And, completing the picture] Work in the field of science to give me some idea of that type of work and that manner of dealing with material.

The courses finally chosen under these aims were: Comparative Religion; History of Western Culture; Conference in 18th Century Literature (to fill in definite gap); Human Genetics. Dramatics went by the board following an unfortunate experience in summer theatre work, but there are still four courses and the spread is even larger than her adviser bargained for; psychology is stubbornly omitted despite the fact that he had suggested it.

With this program Louise continued to show many of the previous patterns in work: her November reports indicated good reading, class discussion, and conference work, with difficulties in delivering a finished written exposition or analysis. By January, the teachers in biology, eighteenth-century literature, and religion complain that while the written work has been achieved, it does not come with dependable frequency. When Louise was working hard on religion and eighteenth-century literature, her work in the history of culture lagged. In the spring she concentrated on this course, however, and brought it, in the words of her instructor, to a "fine finish." But during this period her work in religion came

to a standstill, or rather, after a period of "great new insights, the remainder of the year was spent gathering together the loose ends." This let-down may, of course, have reflected her feeling that she had got the essence of the course and that was all that was important for her purposes.

In some ways Louise's management of her last year was more efficient than that of her faculty's management of their hopes for her. It may not have been solely her doing that program planning had grown into an "issue" about which there were many discordant observations to be made by troubled teachers. But certainly the stubborn refusal to cut down her various interests or to shape them into a more usual academic program or major created the impression of scattered interests and again singled out Louise as an example for study.

In February of her senior year, a meeting of advisers was called for the purpose of studying certain aspects of student guidance. One of the first questions concerned the possible virtues or vices of specialized versus scattered interests, with Louise as an illustration of the problems arising with a student whose interests spread over a wide area.

The point was made that academic or logical "continuity" of program did not always mean continuity in the thinking of the student. This, however, has been the principal concern of Louise's adviser. He had encouraged her toward courses that he felt were good for her as a person, not necessarily courses that would build up a conventional A.B. program.

For example, he had early recognized her as a person rather poorly adjusted; she suffered from temperamental swings all the way from abject discouragement to extreme aggressive and "up-and-at-'em" defiance. Intellectually, she wanted ultimate answers to almost everything, but the next instant saw two sides to every question. She would take criticism submissively, agree with it, and then as surely begin to doubt it and tend to reject it. What logical sequence of material would have satisfied this kind of mind? A principle of con-

traries would be appropriate, and if the contraries were not to be found, at least variety seemed salutary—productive of intellectual growth. There had been another condition to regard with due seriousness: her feeling that her father might each year refuse to allow her to continue. She was impelled by a desire for variety of subject matter partly because she felt she wanted to get everything she could while at college.

Following this general pattern, her professed interest in social science in the first year was satisfied by politics and economics. But the exploratory reading course frankly roamed about; she read widely and diversely. Her interest in publications, strong at first, slackened somewhat, and with an eye to a completely different sort of experience her adviser encouraged the suggestion of the work in the appreciation of music. So, in her second year, her interest in politics and related questions of ethics led her, logically enough, to social theory and anthropology, and she was urged to take critical writing because she obviously needed work of this kind in which she could get help with specific problems of thought and expression. Dramatics was irrelevant to all the above in the logical academic sense, but not in the least irrelevant to Louise. She seemed to need, said her adviser, some justified "opportunity to show off."

In the third year, the fact that dramatics was a course for credit did not satisfy her; she seemed to crave further intellectual justification for having this interest; hence the suggestion of the study of the literature of drama. She recognized her adviser's insistence that she needed more practice in handling facts, so she agreed to his suggestion of modern European history. This course offered a certain strong contrast to the previous course in social theory, both in method and in point of view, and at the same time served as a contrast to the quasi-philosophical material in the much-desired study of Thomas Mann. The latter course had gained a reputation on the campus and the adviser recognized that Louise's

motives were partly concerned with its prestige and partly with working under this particular teacher.

In her fourth year she wished to continue work with this teacher in religion. Her adviser, still recognizing the girl's tendency to seek the other side of the fence, looked in advance for something suitable; he found it in biological science, which he frankly regarded as an antidote to the heavy reading in religion. The history course was again almost certainly a matter of intellectual prestige on the campus, but it was of logical value also in the degree to which it would draw together a large variety of Louise's intellectual interests; it attempted to relate philosophy, literature, art, music, religion as aspects of our culture. On the other hand, Louise still needed training in careful exposition and analysis. The intensive study of eighteenth-century literature was suggested partly for this reason, as well as to provide a contrast of teacher personality.

Her adviser had recently asked Louise to look at her program for four years and challenged her with the questions he knew would come up in this group; she had explained her reasons for choices all the way through. The adviser said frankly that he had made a consistent effort with Louise toward self-recognition. In his December report (in this last year) he had written that she was "learning to come to terms with herself." He thought she had come to recognize her swings to extremes and had gradually come to accept them as necessary and not altogether evil or harmful; that they had consequently become far less extreme, and no longer made her feel anxious about herself. All this he thought had come about through three years of "kidding and cuffing" which seemed to satisfy her temperamental needs.

A second question concerned what is often called "discipline." It became obvious that various "convictions" were put forward here. Some maintained that if Louise had been more consistently made to finish papers and to do small jobs well at the beginning, her work would not have had the

uneven character it still showed. One faculty member, in particular, justified the theory of "spoon feeding" alternated with freedom. If Louise had been given the opportunity to read freely around large topics, and also to have some very simple but very specific tasks to do well, she would have more rapidly become disciplined. In reply to this, one teacher said that Louise had had just these opportunities in her freshman and sophomore years; another, that she had had this sort of thing, but had clearly rejected the small obvious task by doing it with such deadening effect that repetition was discouraged, or by making fun of it with a very demolishing kind of wit. The adviser had asked Louise just this question: Did she think she would have been better off if there had been more insistence upon finishing pieces of work? At first she admitted this was probably the case but later tended to doubt it; this, he pointed out, was her characteristic manner of behavior. The only agreement reached was that Louise had really done excellent pieces of finished work in the theatre and elsewhere when made to, and that there had possibly been an exaggeration of her tendency to let things slide.

The questions concerning discipline asked by several of her teachers in interview were directed at the specific point mentioned in the meeting of advisers as her chief weakness: her inability to relate the general to the particular, to find evidence for generalization, or draw inferences from detail. A number of sweeping statements had been made about this. Her teacher in comparative religion was asked:

Can she make a generalization and then easily relate that to specific evidence, or can she look at evidence and generalize?

He replied:

When it happens it is exceptional. I have the notion that Louise's thinking is of this kind: she is like a small unit of armored cars. It goes out and takes something; then it is out of touch with the rest of the army. Sometimes she can hold this thing, but there is no orderly relationship between fact and hypothesis. Sometimes the hypothesis is justified by one fact, or sometimes by ten—usually

she won't bother to find ten. Her theory is justified by one fact.

Another question was asked:

Is there any characteristic way in which she thinks? Does she get an idea and then go to a fact; or is it characteristically reversed?

She works both ways [he replied], but her way of reading is quite distinct. She does not read the book by taking it all apart. She becomes impressed. She reads with a kind of passionate intensity as the book goes up or down. Things strike her. Then she has the important thing in the book.

This reference to her reading methods is almost identical with that given by a literature teacher who said, "She doesn't read like a person who tries to store up detail. She really takes hold of essentials." But she went on to say that, although Louise often seemed to talk as if she had not read a thing, nevertheless the temperamental similarity and differences between writers would be so sharply given that it was clear proof she had read the material. On the other hand, she would often allow her flair for sensing the similarity of feeling or temperament to obscure a great many important differences in the detailed patterns of thought. She likened Swift to Hobbes, for example, missing the striking differences in the thought of the two men but catching the similarity of attitude and feeling. In short, these remarks indicate that Louise had developed at least an adequate ability to comprehend and to use books full of ideas, but that her methods of working and thinking were not "academic."

There is other evidence that she responded to a firm demand by a teacher.

She wanted to do a "big job" [says her history teacher], but when it came to beginning it, courage failed her. She tried several excuses, half-heartedly: the books I had to recommend were not available; they were printed in 18th Century letters. . . . Hume was very subtle and she was "no good." On her literature teacher's advice I held Louise to it as a debt of honor and she came through with flying colors. In conference she soon began to preach Hume at me, and became interested in the task of boiling down his ideas

and re-expressing them in clear language. The resulting paper was, with the exception of a few florid passages, a really professional job of introduction to Hume.

The preliminary vacillation appears characteristic in that it seems to have been necessary. Other examples of the conflict of emotional forces appeared from time to time throughout her college experience.

Facing the last question, then, concerning the nature of the education this girl achieved, the evidence shows the lack of an ideal academic training. She is by no means the best of students, she is not even always prepared. On the other hand, if Louise is compared to other students and observed in respect to seriousness, sensitiveness, awareness of social and personal values, she appears in a genuinely favorable light. Her literature teacher says:

I do not think her work has been a failure at all. She *feels* more about the 18th Century than the other girls do. She is more mature than she pretends she is, in the sense that she can absorb things—they do not stay on the surface.

In any full sense, the question whether or not Louise could be called "educated" involved much more than her achievement in her courses. It involved consideration of her development as a person, in behavior, attitudes, relations with others, and in understanding of herself. What had the evidence to offer?

One of the most consistent things about Louise's character during her whole college course was her conformity to rules and regulations.

She believes in strict cooperation, rules for conduct. She does a great deal of talking about the community and how to build it up. She has decided ideas on duty and obligations. But in the field of business at large she feels it is every individual for himself. . . . But in spite of the way she feels toward obligations, cooperation, rules, etc., she is individually *for* any girl who will break the rules. However contrary, this is consistent. . . . She is really against authority as much as she is for it. . . . Her puritanism doesn't in-

hibit her perceptions of character relationships in drama—for example, in Shakespeare.

Moral convictions remained about what they were when she came to college—perhaps even increasingly rigid. This moral absolutism was connected with Louise's habitual double attitude toward authority. Often, as in the Student Council, her severe opinions could be counted upon to get a rise from teachers as well as from students. Very probably the direct attempts to argue her into a broader point of view were inspired not so much by solicitude for Louise's soul (though this would have been a natural motive in a course in social theory) as by irritation, annoyance, or humorous offense caused by her own verbal explosions of righteousness. The violence of these was, no doubt, largely due to the conflict between tendencies within herself, but it also sought expression in stirring the reactions she sometimes enjoyed in others.

This, perhaps, is one point at which Louise's education was successful. It did furnish complex and impersonal content of knowledge for the sums that often added up to zero. The latent hostility toward authority in the girl pretty certainly dictated the method of balancing one thing against another. Being made this way, she found a method of learning; she used the hostile impulses for intellectual discovery. If the college did anything for Louise, it did just this, it furnished her with a way of thought suited to her temperament; it allowed her to think by hurling contraries at different authorities.

There is a passage in the notes of one teacher which describes the manner of Louise's entry into class.

She comes in, plants herself with a great and brief noise, and she is set for the fight. She is in a corner beside me ready for the fight. The class will be going on; there will be a slight flurry of discussion, then a point is hit that meets with resistance from Louise. She pushes everything aside (gestures) and lets go. The class is electrified into response, usually against Louise, and we are at it. When she loses, she gives up as an Englishman would

give up a lost cricket game. That is off, it's all in the game; then she is ready for the next.

Sometimes she would find the most farcical mode of expression for her safe attacks on authority. The most vivid of her episodes of combat with her adviser is the picketing riot:

I came to my office about ten minutes late for a don conference with Louise [this in her fourth year]. There were giggles and whisperings down the hall; then a procession of two—Louise and M.J.—began marching up and down past the door saying in unison “He is unfair to his *donnees*. He has no interest in their love-life.” This went on for two or three minutes; then the pickets came in, very much pleased with themselves. “Now what have you got to say?” I told them the story about the lady who asked the zoo guard whether the hippopotamus was male or female, and was told, “That, madam, is a matter of interest only to another hippopotamus.” Louise picked up a book and made as if to throw it. “I hate you. That’s all right to say to a skinny gazelle like J. here—but how about *my* feelings? And what do you think *you* look like? . . . Get out of here, J.; I want to have a talk with this old hippopotamus.”

At other times her wit would take a turn just short of pathos, with a clear note of self-depreciation, however bold the start might have been. Louise knew, as her adviser puts it, “that by being aggressively negative about things you are likely to get more vital, if not more accurate, stuff from teachers, or at least from most teachers.” On the whole she was shrewd in choosing teachers with whom this would work. She liked to push, so that somebody would push back. “Louise, like Nature, abhors a vacuum,” her adviser explained, when asked by one of the research staff if he regarded this aspect of her conduct as “compulsive.”

But she also wants that pushing back to be done without animosity and in a spirit of good hard play. To some extent at least, she blusters because she likes to rather than because she must. Maybe she likes to because she *must* like to; but if we’ve got to run it back that far, everyone is compulsive, and the term loses meaning. Nevertheless, her contentiousness is very definitely NOT just on the surface, but is an integral part of her.

If this was the case it might be asked, as it was implicitly asked through the worry of the faculty over her, whether or not she was really teachable? Indeed, what the college was facing at this time was just this question, directed, not only to Louise, but to other students as well. If teachability rested upon the student's developing the ability clearly to choose between this and that point of view after collecting the evidence; if it meant declaring an interest, pushing ahead with the study of it entirely on her own initiative and reaching an organized rational conclusion in nicely written form, without pressure; if it meant finding a specific intellectual interest to the exclusion of others before senior year, arriving at a mature point of view toward life, herself, politics, and love, and learning itself—then certainly Louise was not educable, and for all these purposes had failed, more or less.

But what the teachers who were studying individuals were finding out in her case, as in many others, was that educability could be defined in no such simple terms. The learning process appeared less and less purely rational, the further one went into it. For instance in Louise's case, whether or not she could be said really to be thinking more logically at the end of her college course than at the beginning depended on several things that were not merely a matter of reason. To what extent was she still intensely subjective in her reactions to all material? What about her attitude toward her father, on the one hand, and toward herself on the other? To what extent was she still the victim of a fear of her own unaccountable swing from buoyancy to despair, from aggressiveness to submission, which made her feel that she should be different from what she was? Concerning these questions, the evidence collected in the spring of her last year has some specific pertinence.

References to Louise's discussion of her father and her relationship to the family are fairly frequent in earlier periods; they are much less frequent during the last year. Her literature teacher wrote toward the end of the last year:

Her attitude toward her family seems to me to have undergone a change. From what she says about her past, she is much less hurt, more detached, by what her father thinks of her as a college student. In the last few months I have been impressed by her detachment with regard to him. She has just gotten a job at one of the large department stores in New York on a training squad. She described in detail the conversation she had with her father about this job. He had thought her a good-for-nothing—or at least she thinks he had—now he thinks she is wonderful; she speaks now with detachment about both attitudes.

Her adviser agreed that there had been a change in Louise's attitude toward her family:

I have progressively heard less about father's intentions and opinions, and about Louise's arguments with him. When she does mention him now—which isn't very often—it is with much less tenseness and emotional pressure. He is not so immediately important as he used to be. Several factors operate here. One very important factor is her own success at college, which has led him to give her more respect in her own right, and she values that a lot. She is turning out to be the best of the family. With this acquisition of status she has developed a kind of tolerance for him and for *herself in relation to him*. She understands her own nature better, as well as his, and has gained perspective about their squabbles and serious differences in opinion. Perhaps I might say that she loves him less and likes him more; but I should want to add that she can like him more because she likes herself better than she used to.

After she got her job, he told her he hoped she would live at home. Louise refused to fall in with the plan on the ground that she expected to have work to do, and a life of her own to make. She expects to run in to see him and the rest of them frequently, but is quite sure she won't live at home. It seems that the matter has been settled in an amicable way; and the general feeling-tone of her account of it all was so even and quiet, and the general impression so clearly one of good sense and sound judgment, that I felt very happy about it.

Another important fact occurs in the records of Louise's last year. There are allusions in her talk with two teachers to something called "a nervous breakdown" during the previous summer. That Louise had taken the summer job in the

theatre partly as a trial of what further work in that line would imply is almost unquestionable. Her mind was already on her future, on the question of how her last year in college could best prepare her for some activity which would gain recognition, financial independence for herself, and a kind of self-justification or proof of merit. The summer experience appears to have dismissed the theatre as a plausible alternative.

The swing from aggressive to a submissive or self-deprecatory attitude in Louise's character appeared to be less marked during the last year; little stress is laid upon it in the confidential reports, interviews or written notes except to note improvement.

Conclusion

If we return now to the central question of the development of Louise's character through four years of college it is relevant to recall certain conclusions reached by the small group of teachers studying her record after the first four months of her college course. They had made certain observations and predictions: they had noted the ambivalence toward authority; the tendency toward doubts and self-deprecation when she started anything important; they had observed the unsatisfied intellectual craving for answers to ultimate questions; the fear of giving herself to any one thing wholly, of getting too close to anyone or anything. Hence, they had predicted a probable incapacity to find a deep or fixed interest. After four years of college work what modifications had occurred in any of these traits? The material just summarized offers some basis of generalization.

The "two-barreled" sort of person is still in evidence, but the "ambivalent" responses to authority are not so marked and occur largely under certain conditions. The tendency toward doubts and self-deprecatory gestures is certainly present, but it is less in evidence. The spells of uncertainty occur chiefly when there is some big task to face and do not

remain a consistent feature of all her behavior. They appear either linked to situations which involve authority or are concerned with an important demand. That Louise can break through this uncertainty and complete the task or fulfill the demand has been demonstrated; she can be successful, but she has to be forced at the start. The recommendation that authority should be used as an aid rather than an imposed punitive regulation seems to have been an excellent one; it has worked in a number of instances, throughout the four years.

The craving for final answers has considerably lessened, as her experience in intellectual areas has satisfied her aggressive impulses: the more she has been able to argue points, the more she has recognized that ultimate answers are few and far between, and the more ready has she been to leave it at that. Perhaps this had been the broadening process which the psychiatrist who advised with the group hoped might occur—at least Louise turned gradually from a self-centered or subjective quest for ultimate answers to a broad and more objectively curious interest in the history of ideas.

The last of the character tendencies noted by this group of teachers—the fear of getting too close to anyone or anything—is the only trait that appears to suffer little or no modification. She has not really discovered an abiding interest; she has, in that sense, no real major.

One could not say that her college course remained unmotivated. But the motivation lies only partly within intellectual areas; she genuinely liked ideas, but she had a practical motive for college. She had begun with the idea that she was preparing herself primarily to earn her own living: not by a literal vocational training program; rather, she hoped to educate herself in directions which would be relevant to this aim, but get a good deal more besides. The job, vocation, profession, changes in form all the way along, but it is there and it crystallizes in the shape of a young executive. The

underlying motive for such visions of ego-grandeur was to prove to herself that she could gain her father's approbation. The choice of courses in college and the work in these courses remain entirely consistent with an aim of this kind. The aim is literally worked out. Louise leaves college with this victory over doubt assured; she has a broad experience with liberal arts behind her; the job ahead does pay. To what extent this can be regarded as intellectual integration must be left for the reader to decide.

Summary

The study of Louise serves to illustrate a number of points developed in earlier discussions.

1. The difficulty of arriving at a clear picture of a personality: Her behavior was so full of contradictions and variations from one situation to another, that teachers found it hard to agree about her character. This dilemma is not, to be sure, as unusual as one might imagine after reading a series of case studies presenting apparently clear-cut personality structures. Evaluating motivation is a risky business. Mistakes and disagreements are the rule when we are dealing with the masks, evasions, and compensations typical of many people in our culture. Clarity and a consensus of agreement emerge only gradually as observations are pooled over a period of time. The individual teacher is suspect who arrives at a finished summary of an individual without taking into account the observations by other teachers in different situations. The most dependable account of a student is the one in which all the variations and contradictions are seen in relation to the underlying pattern which explains them.

2. Louise's behavior illustrates the interaction of forces from different periods of a girl's experience: the trauma of her mother's death and the continuing pressure from her father; the resulting ambivalence toward authority and relations with people expressed in alternations of arrogance and

TEST RECORD FOR LOUISE

PRE-COLLEGE RECORD

<i>Name of Test</i>		<i>IQ</i>
Otis	Form D	108
	Form A	117
	Form B	121
	Form C	119
Iowa Silent Reading Test Form A: Rev. Comprehension Score, 110½; (Rate of Reading, 29)		
Haggerty Reading Examination		<i>Total Score</i>
Stigma 3	Form A	114
	Form B	109
	Form C	110½

COLLEGE RECORD

American Council on Education

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
Completion	56	Analogies	46
Arithmetic	31	Opposites	79
Artificial Language	36	Gross Score	56

Bernreuter Personality Inventory

B1-N	94	B4-D	18
B2-S	32	F1-C	86
B3-1	91	F2-S	55

Allport-Vernon Values Study (scores from 31 to 28 are average)

	<i>Score</i>		<i>Score</i>
Theoretical	19	Social	39
Economics	20½	Political	28½
Aesthetic	37½	Religious	35½

Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Women

Nurse	B-	Lawyer	B-
Housewife	B+	Physician	C
Social Worker	B-	Librarian	C+
Secretary Stenographer	B	Artist	C
Teacher in General	B+	Author	C+

self-deprecation; her defense against her fears by clowning, which in turn sustained her difficulties in developing close relationships with people and work.

3. Her experience in college illustrates the problems teachers found in the scattered program; interests that had vitality but did not lead to the cumulative mastery hoped for by her teachers, or to the kind of personal integration considered even more important.

A PRACTICAL, LIMITED STUDENT:

FERN

FERN came to Sarah Lawrence College from high school in an Eastern state. She seemed to all the teachers who met her during the first period of conference to be an exceptionally straightforward, healthy individual. She had a kind of healthy energy about her that was impressive; she was exuberant about all the prospects in store for her. What she wanted from college was "to be a well-educated refined lady who can conduct herself well under any circumstances." She chose Sarah Lawrence College because, as she says, "I thought I could be happy there and be able to take subjects which I really am interested in and could therefore benefit most from them in my later life." Certainly from her point of view courses in English and visual art would at least foster "refinement," and she was probably told that the course dealing with opinions and prejudices would help her to discriminate false from true thinking. On the other hand, from the point of view of her advisers, such a program could logically be hoped to break down the "refined lady ideal" into something more substantial and more closely related to the world she would probably have to live in; moreover, the subjects of art, social science, and literature would provide a reasonable academic balance—language or science might come later. So her schedule was made out: exploratory literature, visual arts, and the introduction to social science (a course called "Opinions and Prejudices").

The first warnings that all was not going quite as well as might have been expected came at the end of six weeks, when preliminary reports were turned in to the Director of Education. The impressions of exuberance, energy, and straightforwardness are sustained by all those dealing with Fern, but there are also serious reservations. For example, the English

teacher stressed her "limited intelligence" and the fact that she has "no intellectual interests that I can find"; the art teacher finds her a conscientious worker with little imagination and a tendency toward the "drawing-room romantic" in design. He discovers that in a situation where she has to work freely with a medium such as clay or metal to be hammered into a shape, she cannot visualize the desired form; she works much more happily when mechanical techniques impose a form or help with the pattern, as in the case of the potter's wheel or the loom. The teacher in social science verifies the picture of energy and enthusiasm yet adds, "she is curious but ostensibly unreflective—she avoids firsthand experience."

It is at this period that we begin to get information about Fern's life in college as a whole. Her record of absences from the campus show frequent trips home over week ends rather than the usual college football games and dances so characteristic of any freshman's autumn record. She talks freely with her English teacher about her college experience. What is bothering her at this time is not her work—she is unaware of scholastic difficulties, but she is aware of the great difference between the high-school environment and that of the college campus: "The girls are nicer here," she says, but she is by no means at ease with them. She feels the pressure of social competition inevitably present in freshman year as the new girls get acquainted, size each other up, and attempt to establish their social status. She is becoming aware that the number and kind of dates, partners at dances, opinions about what is done and not done are of importance in the first few months of college. Fortunately she is able to talk quite frankly about it without any feeling of exaggerated confidence or confession. The English teacher is impressed with her forthrightness and common sense in the midst of what was evidently an uncomfortable situation. "She ran some danger of becoming a snob," says this teacher in a running record of her experiences with Fern.

She was panic stricken when she thought girls who had been to expensive schools might find out she had gone to high school. She felt herself socially inferior to them and was afraid they would find it out. She tried at once, and I think more consciously than most girls, to adapt her clothes and speech and opinions to theirs. Early in the year she spoke to me about this. "I'm scared to death the girls will find out I went to high school. Whenever they start talking about their schools I change the subject as quickly as I can. My boy friend at Princeton is in the same fix—when they ask him where he came from he always names some good boys' school, and he hasn't got caught yet." She went on to say her father could have sent her to any school in the country, but he thought she ought to go to a coeducational school and he thought mixing with all sorts of people in a high school would be good for her. I don't know whether this is the reason or not. Her father made his money in the coal business. Daughters of railroad executives and bank directors awe her. We talked about this for a while, but I was unable to convince her that there were advantages in not spending all your life in exclusive girls' schools.

There is evidence that this feeling of social inferiority had something to do with Fern's growing dislike of the social-science courses which attacked race attitudes and other social problems. There is no evidence that she was particularly conscious of the connection or that she realized that one aim of such a course was directed toward exposing the irrational grounds for many opinions and prejudices involving racial and social discrimination. But that she felt the intent is evidenced by her growing antagonism to the teacher. That Fern's attempt to adjust to a new environment, probably far less snobbish than she felt it to be, actually tended to defeat the kind of thinking the teacher was trying to stimulate is vividly apparent in the record of the following episode:

At an early interview she told me she was reading books by and about Negroes for class. At that time we were reading books that raised the question of the adjustment of people of one race or nationality or temperament, to an alien world. Although we did not talk about Negroes at all she saw that the issues were the same. She said she could never bring herself to sit down by a Negro in a train, and asked me if I would. She seemed genuinely surprised

when I said that I would and had. She told me she had got into a train recently and that the only vacant seat in the car was next to a Negro. "I couldn't sit there, so I went into the next car. There weren't any seats there either, so I stood. I didn't want to stand in the other car when there was a seat." She went on to say that if she did try to be "broad-minded" the other girls would hold it against her. "If the girls saw me walking up the campus with a Negro they wouldn't say 'Oh, look at Fern—she's so unprejudiced.' They'd think there was something the matter with me."

Certainly by Thanksgiving we have evidence that Fern was becoming aware of trouble in her social-science course. Her attitude toward the other courses, however, remained enthusiastic. She had no sense of intellectual inferiority. Having grasped the proper social pattern for opinions she avoided any comparisons beyond this. She recognized that one or two of the girls in the English class were "terribly bright," but she never discovered that anyone found more meaning in what went on than she did. In both the art studio and the conferences with the English teacher she was always anxious to find out what the teachers wanted and to do it.

Acute difficulties arose when she was asked to work toward ends of her own not dictated by a method or a teacher. Deliberately to draw forth a shape from a lump of clay or meaning from a book was more than she could do. The following incidents from the running record of work in the art studio are significant examples.

She showed astonishing ability as soon as she was placed before the loom. After having been shown the mechanism of the loom, she proceeded to work with very little help and is now working completely alone.

[A week later.] The fact that today she is given free choice of her selection of materials and type of experiment makes her feel at a loss. She decides to continue working on the loom and to follow the studio work of the group only as much as necessary. Weaving with its well-defined apparatus gives her a lead in her work that she misses in the present project.

[Three weeks later.] She makes a pretty good clay vessel. She works rather slowly and without much facility but with patience, good will and a resigned "we do our part" attitude.

She starts on a clay figure but does not seem to be able to visualize what it is going to be.

Rather discouraged today. Plans to do a little weaving for recreation. I am all for it because I feel it will bring back her self-confidence.

[Just prior to Thanksgiving.] She tackles clay again. Wishes to make a turkey. We bless Thanksgiving as a source of plastic inspiration. While she works, her turkey turns into a sequence of other birds more or less known to mankind. I encourage her to watch the forms emerging from her fingers and to see if she could not take a fancy to one of them regardless of whether it is a seasonal bird or not. She begins to get interested in form.

[Six weeks later.] Very awkward. She seems to think that the outcome of her work is due to some higher power—has no hope that she might better her results under her own power.

Her sketch is quite acceptable. San Antony must have helped her a lot. She does not know who else could be responsible for the improvement. She denies emphatically that she has improved her technique and insists that she worked just the same way as before.

[Two weeks later.] She tackles her plaster with innocent glee and wonders what will happen. She enjoys tremendously to see things happen when she puts her knife to the plaster, but has little idea of the relationship between cause and result applied to her knife and her work.

She finishes her figure and strangely enough it looks just like what one would expect her to try to do. She really has something to do with it even if she does not believe it. Her work is rather "cute" than good, but neat and not without charm. She is pleased with it but again her pleasure is that of somebody who got a nice and unexpected present rather than of someone who surveys the result of his own work.

In the record of Fern's experience in literature there are analogies to this strange impersonal process of learning under the direction of the teacher. What she read or discussed appears to have stimulated her to think only when it impinged upon her life in an immediate sense. For example:

In class one day she raised what appeared to be a fundamental question with her: How do you tell a good book from a bad one? The problem was simple while you were in school, because presumably in school you were never asked to read anything but good books—and apparently they were somehow good for you

even if you didn't like them—but how are you going to tell by yourself? Her own feeling was that you could somehow tell from the physical appearance of the book—the printing and paper and binding, and the color of the cover—whether it was a “good” book or not. She said she couldn't describe these differences, but she thought she could recognize them.

In the beginning she read rather less than most of the girls, and I think still does. And she gets rather less of what she reads. Her first paper, written about some of the books she had read during the first period, was very bad. She said she wanted to write on the women characters in *Sons and Lovers*, *Clayhanger*, and *Martin Eden*, and *Giants in the Earth*. I had not urged her to do any individual work up to this time because she clearly would have chosen something arbitrarily, since nothing at all in her reading or in the discussion led to anything she wanted to continue. This selection was made, I am sure, simply in imitation of another student. I asked her why she selected these particular books and I could only gather from her vague reply that she remembered these rather better than others she had read. I asked her to make a plan for the paper she intended to write, but she did not do this. She was unable to come to the next conference, and the following week she handed in her paper. It was no more than a series of short papers on the separate books, tacked end on end. I used the paper as an illustration of how this sort of thing should not be done, in a talk to the class on organizing material. She professed to understand what I was talking about, and gradually as the year went on she came to see that you do not write a paper by tacking bits of unrelated materials together.

I get little reaction to the books read in class. She seems to feel that most books are too long—that you could really get the story in much less space than most authors take. At the beginning of the year she found *Upstream* dull because it was a long book and hardly anything happened, and she thought *Giants in the Earth* was much ado about nothing. Six months later she complained of Shakespeare's *Richard III* and Virginia Woolf's *Room of One's Own*, for the same reason.

At the middle of the year, two of the three teachers appear to have been patient and inclined to wait for further results before pointing out to Fern even in a generalized way the unsatisfactory aspects of her work. Much her best report comes from art, where she is said to have made good progress

In "Opinions and Prejudices" her teacher considers her work with the group satisfactory and compliments Fern on her admirable effort in her individual work, "which has called for the use of somewhat unfamiliar material and new methods of work." This guarded comment is amplified in a confidential footnote:

Abstractions are difficult for Fern to be interested in, to formulate or to handle critically. I think that problems which start with very concrete data and clear practical significance will help her.

This is an interesting comment upon the girl's direct dealings with this teacher, particularly in the face of what she was beginning to confide to another teacher about the course. Speaking of a field trip she had said, "It was simply terrible—I can't believe it's true. I didn't like—I don't like—seeing things like that and I don't want to know about them—but I ought to." The teacher adds, "One is inclined to wonder if it is possible that Fern was somewhat closer to those things than many of the other girls; that such facts had a stronger feeling of reality for her than for some of the others. She is a tender-hearted soul in spite of her vitality and hard-boiled manner."

The report from literature is the only one which gives directly to the student any specific criticism or indication of what she needs to do to better her work. Her adviser's report gives the impression of uncertainty about the girl and no great hope of her gaining a great deal from college. Altogether, the reports indicate that she was proceeding with routine performances industriously and had not yet faced the question of getting more from her educational experience than this. Perhaps the reluctance of the teachers to tell her so, directly, is an indication of their unconscious feeling that if the attempt was made, she would be quite unable to understand what they were talking about. This is to be inferred from her running record. In the studio her art teacher is much too amused to consider scolding her directly; and besides, she continues to do very good work on the loom. His

record of February gives a clear picture not only of Fern's early difficulties in getting beyond a factual level but also of her naïveté and her skill.

She listens to everything [but] I am afraid she does not very well follow because if she thinks she understands something she always grins happily.

She elects as her studio project the making of a tapestry of a pretty good size.

She thinks the Pueblos are funny.

She seems very much puzzled about our whole discussion of Indian life and happy only if a story is being told to illustrate a point.

[Three weeks later.] Her paper on the Pueblos is full of information but shows not the slightest sign of an ability to interpret facts or to use them for her personal ends.

Her silence this time not only is the result of her usual lack of initiative in discussions. She actually has never heard of the Renaissance.

Works at loom—she is by far at her best in weaving because she has a real feeling for fabrics and enjoys the strictness of the method.

But for Fern, there was neither method nor routine in "Opinions and Prejudices"—there were only intangibles and the demand, now more pressing, to think about them and get something written about them. Her social-science instructor proceeded gradually to push beyond "concrete data" in demands for project writing. Fern became increasingly troubled and confided more and more in her literature teacher who noted Fern's complaints:

My psychology teacher said to write a paper on anything that had to do with any idea or opinion or prejudice I had—and I can't think of a single thing to write. She said to do it if I found something that interested me, and if I couldn't, just not to do it. I can't think of anything, and then I begin to think, "What is the matter with me—something must be wrong—can't I get interested in anything—am I indifferent to everything? And then I get started worrying about myself."

I told her I thought it was an experience everybody had now

and then. She says she takes it out on her family because she doesn't want to take it out on the girls—"I know I won't feel like that a week later, and I don't want to get them all mad at me. I shake myself and say, 'Look here, what's the matter with you? Haven't you got everything you want? You have enough money for everything you want, and can't you do as you please?' But that doesn't help a bit. When you feel like this it doesn't do any good at all to talk about how lucky you are."

Perhaps, indeed, anxiety might have been the result of the kindly intentioned pressure in this one course if the pressure had been repeated in the other two. But this did not occur. The chief trouble was that Fern was working in three areas outside her common-sense world. She was genuinely confused by an increasing feeling that all was not going well, although she was probably steadied by the fact that her adjustment to the social life of the campus, to the girls whom she thought "nicer," had enormously improved. She had friends on the campus now and her absence registration shows that she was able to make several ventures into the realms of social conquest. Her trips home had decreased in number as the year progressed.

The March reports were more candid than any heretofore. Her work in art is reported as good; in social science as definitely unsatisfactory; in literature as "about the same as at the time of the last report." The only allusion to improvement in the reports is a reference to a paper which is better than the earlier ones. All the reports comment upon her determination and industry while expressing doubts about her ability; her social-science teacher is still hopeful of progress. Fern's adviser summarizes the situation sharply:

She is simple and friendly and our conferences are no strain. They are a recital of things that she is doing, where she is going and the books she has read but she has never been able to express any idea of the reality of any experience.

She has reached a real impasse with her Social Science. She must actually produce something. She is in a difficult situation because her natural tendency is to go through with things and think that

no more is needed. She does not know how to understand the ideas of others and is not able to be constructive with ones of her own.

The manual work in art has been interesting and helpful. She has been able to work out plans and carry them through with fair success. She is not able to talk about what she has done.

On the whole, college has been a great pleasure for her. She is willing and cooperative.

To the Student Work Committee this faint praise of industry and good intention was pretty damning. Should Fern be allowed to return the following year? Her social-science teacher was somewhat puzzled; she wondered if the girl was of second-year quality, yet was not without hope that "insistence will begin the process of independent thought." The art instructor considered her able to continue work in art on a second-year level. Her literature teacher commented sharply, implying the moral dilemma which her teachers would bring upon themselves if she continued in college.

I think this girl's limitations were clear fairly early in the year. Not much can be expected of her in actual achievement, or understanding, or insight. But she is a healthy downright person who has come to have quite a bit of curiosity about the things she is trying to learn, and who is anxious to "get ahead," anxious enough, indeed, so that she has undertaken to learn techniques against which she at first rebelled violently. She contributes a wholesome common-sense tone to discussions that is good for a class.

If one considers this report in detail the dilemma becomes more and more apparent: why should anyone recommend keeping a student in college for whom "not much could be expected in actual achievement, or understanding or insight"? On the other hand, one could find almost any number of teachers who would favor keeping in college a person whose qualities could be summarized as "healthy, downright" and "who has quite a bit of curiosity about the things she is trying to learn" and who "is anxious to get ahead, anxious enough, indeed, so that she has undertaken to learn techniques against which she at first rebelled violently." Yet

this was the whole person—at least in terms of her behavior at that time.

The decision of the Committee was to allow Fern to return, without full second-year standing, and to permit her classification to be determined by the nature of her work the following year. Such a decision, though not frequently made, usually implies some fairly strong expectation of development in the following year. Here there was only the forthright character and the general assumption that, having allowed the student to enter college, the college had an obligation to give her the benefit of every doubt. Perhaps it was argued that a different sort of program might bring to light qualities as yet unforeseen.

One thing, at least, was certain from the records of this first year. Interests, so far as one can discover, are really not there, except the sole interest of "getting ahead." She has at the end of the year just as firm an expectation of assigned tasks as she had at the beginning, but she is confused and blindly determined when she does not know what is expected of her, and, when this is the case, is apt to show increasing anxiety about her assignments.

From the point of view of educational theory the program of three experimental courses—flexible, uncompetitive, rich in discussion and experiment, and without the lash of authority but with continual questioning of conventional opinion by the teachers and many of the students—might have been expected to break down the cultural ideal of "the refined lady" for which Fern entered college. It did nothing of the kind so far as one can see. She went about her own business in a determined way; she did adapt her behavior to Sarah Lawrence patterns as far as she could and she did interest herself to the degree that will power can stimulate interest. She tried to become happy, as she says in her autobiography, in "being very active socially." But in comparative terms, her social activities were almost as meager as her academic achievements.

The failure to become a second-year student in good standing was a genuine shock to Fern and her family. Her parents were told, of course, before the end of the college year, and her literature teacher records a conversation with them at the end of the year:

We talked about it—both parents patient and a little hurt and both talking about how important it was that she have another chance to make good and that this sort of thing, they knew, was not uncommon. I tried to reassure them, too, but at that time was doubtful whether the girl could do any better work than she had done. She felt, I think, that I was responsible for the non-classification, but in spite of this she brought the trouble about finding an adviser to me, and I told her I would act as adviser in the autumn until some other arrangement could be made. This seemed to relieve her mind a little, and her mother said, "I'm sure she'll feel better than if she had to go off to someone she didn't know."

The change of adviser was necessitated by entirely impersonal administrative circumstances. Her previous adviser had considered the future change in June. She writes:

Fern left college somewhat shaken in her confidence. She feels that her literature teacher is a most stimulating person and she was so sorry that she could not be her don. I have talked with this teacher and she feels that she will be able to give her some attention in the beginning of the year. Fern's plans for courses are vague. She feels that she may make the wrong choice of instructor and that may block her progress another year. I do feel that she should have help with further work. I think that she should wait until she finds the course that interests her the most and an instructor who has some understanding of her problems and then change her don.

This prospect appeared simple enough if one underrated the strength of Fern's real motivation—to get ahead—and, in this critical situation, to avoid whatever errors she had made the year before. But how indeed could she give free, easy reign to curiosity or what we like to think of as real, or intellectual interests, when her status in the community—at least with teachers and the administration—was uncertain?

Being a practical, outgoing person, she took what she regarded as the practical view of the whole situation; blamed herself without fancy excuses and evidently made up her mind not to be the fool again. Perhaps the most characteristic thing about her behavior during the early autumn of the new school year was that she thought through her problems in terms of her relationship with people; thereby shocking the teachers who advised her, for their professional slant led them to see her and themselves in terms of interests in subject matter. Educationally, the teachers seemed to feel that she was really avoiding the real issues. From her point of view, one must assume, "interests" had become irrelevant in such a crisis; subject matter was secondary, the teacher was crucial. Which view was the more realistic, I shall leave the reader to judge. At any event, Fern's determination to make the grade was putting us on trial.

Her temporary adviser writes:

She came to my office on one of the first days of college to discuss her program, still greatly disturbed at not being classified, and determined in a kind of teeth-clenching way to correct this. All her attention seemed to be directed to this end, and she was quite frank about it and about the method she had outlined for herself. "I'm going to get that diploma no matter what happens, and since I have to depend on teachers to get it I'm going to find out what I can do best and what they want of me, and that's what I'll do." Her whole manner was that of a general planning a strategic campaign. Then, and for several conferences afterward she asked many questions about different faculty, showing much more interest in them than in what they taught. Her attitudes last year were largely determined by her sense of social insecurity and her desire to be like other Sarah Lawrence girls; she had now, in a completely single-minded way, shifted her attention to her faculty. She manifested almost no interest in the things to be studied—she had a job to do (and a rather unpleasant one) and she was going to do it. It was somewhat shocking and rather depressing, although not altogether surprising, to see this girl's eye directed so unswervingly on the diploma that nothing else existed, and to watch the cool, calculating way she mustered her forces. She must have asked hundreds of questions of other students concerning

faculty, because she discussed minutely their acceptability and the possibility of her getting along with one or another of them.

She finally decided to work with her former art teacher in history of art because she had felt secure in his course last year and she liked him; she chose introductory psychology, with emphasis on child psychology, because "she liked the straightforward way of the instructor, that she was the kind of a person she could get along with and she felt everything would be clear." Finally also, in her choice of a literature course, because the way in which the classwork had been described appeared to her definite, she concluded that in this course she would always know where she was. There is not a single record of any reasoning on Fern's part that has to do with the subject matter of these courses.

"I suggested that she try something besides literature," notes the adviser, and continues,

but she was unwilling to begin working in any field with which she was unfamiliar. She made a very happy choice in Child Psychology and she wanted to let well enough alone. A laboratory science she refused to consider (in spite of the fact that she had said she liked Biology in high school) and the thought of social science was very frightening. One day she came in to say she had decided to take a different literature course. She had been to see the teacher. "She's very friendly and so young and so attractive."

The adviser had considerable misgiving about Fern's choice, for she found that the literature course was reading eighteenth-century novels, and it was fairly clear that Fern had not the faintest idea of what it was all about. Moreover, in the preceding year Fern had had difficulty getting much out of even fairly simple contemporary fiction. But she appeared sure of herself and, with what appears by this time to have been the awakening of respect for her generalship, the adviser set aside her misgivings and signed the transfer.

For Fern, the course—in fact all three courses—brought success from the beginning. The year went smoothly, with only the slightest indecision in the middle of the year, when

she shifted from art to homemaking because another teacher was taking the second term history of art and specializing in architecture. For Fern the change of teaching personality was significant; for the teachers, the shift to architecture was reason enough for recognizing the request to change. The homemaking course appeared particularly suitable. The story of Fern's moral triumph—her victory of generalship—can be easily read through the following brief reports:

CHILD IN THE FAMILY.—This student's development has been marked and her achievement completely satisfactory. Part of this result is to be attributed to the fact that work with young children has proved to be of outstanding importance as a dominant interest. Her work as a student assistant has been very successful. She is the only student I feel sure could meet satisfactorily the daily demands of a job as a nursery school teacher. She is capable of organizing an activity schedule planfully, is self-reliant when it comes to handling quarrels, and is infrequently at a loss to know what to do. She is capable of further development in the field of nursery education should she decide to do further work. She has been a rewarding student with whom to work.

ENGLISH NOVEL.—She has done a very satisfactory year's work. She has learned to read with understanding and to write with clarity. She always expresses herself well orally; a group discussion which she led was one of the most interesting we have had this year. She has good practical ability, a strong personality, and a sense of responsibility. She should make a very good teacher.

HOMEMAKING.—This student's interests have been rather scattered in this field. She preferred to generalize rather than concentrate. Her greatest interest has been in the aspects of the work which applied to child development. In connection with this she did a contract on equipment for children's rooms which was superior to her other work.

It is obvious that Fern's moral triumph in achieving the diploma was not entirely unqualified. But there was good evidence of unusually solid work, a consistent pace, and considerable independence. It was a clear gain over the previous year; the decision was favorable and the diploma granted.

Her adviser noted:

The day before commencement she came to tell me her mother and father would be up, and she wanted me to talk to them. She felt they hadn't been as much impressed as they should have been by the fact that she had been offered a job in a nursery school (in the city) and "if you tell them that students don't get offers like that every day that will please them." So when I saw them and her boy friend the next day, I said all the things she wanted me to say and the parents were duly pleased, and the boy friend duly impressed.

At this point it may be well asked whether or not any very real education actually took place during this second year; whether or not the motivation to succeed so overweighed all other considerations that Fern closed the year without any genuine interests and with the identical set of attitudes with which she began. Furthermore, what had the college done for her in helping her shape her future direction; were there any new values? What now were her plans? Fortunately the story is clear in running records.

In October, Fern began her conferences in psychology in a very businesslike manner; she always announced what she had read, what suggestions she had followed up; she usually had a few questions to ask. She also took the initiative in choosing a subject for a paper. Yet her attitude was dutiful and submissive to an extreme.

Following two class discussions on the backgrounds of present interest in Child Psychology. Fern announced that she had become interested in the background of the nursery school movements and wanted to read something of Froebel's, Owen's and Pestalozzi's principles. However, the choice of this kind of a subject which would lend itself to comparative treatment seemed to me to be an advance in her own estimation over some of the things that she had done last year.

She went ahead with the reading and was delighted when she found the English teacher willing to criticize her organization and writing of the material; she worked doggedly and persistently and handed in the paper on the contract dead line. She willingly followed out all suggestions in preparing

the paper made by both teachers, though instead of following references to further source readings she cautiously stuck to the original three names.

At the teacher's suggestion she visited a kindergarten in a Yonkers public school with the purpose of comparing, against her reading, the methods and routines regularly used today in kindergarten work. The paper was a solid, careful job but the comparison of new with old methods remained a sketchy addition at the end of it. "She seemed unable to think carefully about present-day uses of the methods of the three original educators," contenting herself with a few generalizations in this regard. But during the period of time which it took to complete the project several things began to happen to Fern. For example, one finds notes in the record which introduce a new tone—she is enjoying nursery school. "Most of Fern's comments about the nursery school situation have been couched in humorous terms. She remembers amusing things that the children have said, ridiculous postures, gestures, etc." A few weeks later Fern had gained enough confidence to assert preferences:

She says she is not much interested in delinquency and that she doesn't want to go on the field trip to the Children's Village and the Penitentiary. She said she would be glad to go however, if I thought it would be good for her. I told her it was not essential.

Her participation in class during the first of the term had been that of an interested observer but about the middle of December, during a discussion of "the only child" situation, members of the group turned to her and asked her opinion as to the handicaps of an only child. Without any feeling and with considerable clarity she described her own relationship to her parents, mentioning her obligations, the difficulty of planning independent vacations, getting away from home, her parents' desire to see her make a good record. She violently objected to an idea which had been expressed that the only child grew up without benefit of criticism, feeling that she got good criticism from her contemporaries.

By December, she was sufficiently interested in the participation in the nursery school to wish to change to a W.P.A.

school where there were fewer student assistants and where she would therefore have a larger share of responsibility. At this time also she expressed a desire to take a special biology unit in order to learn something about biology before leaving college.

Her adviser commented on a new maturity in her interest in the children:

I was often surprised at the quality of this interest—it was not dictated particularly by fondness for the children, or by a concern for finding out the things she was expected to find out. It appeared rather to be a very mature interest in observing what was happening. She projected herself into the place of the teacher, analyzed the problem and thought about how she would handle it. The minuteness of detail which was part of her recollection of what happened bears testimony to the way she observed.

The nature of her conferences with her psychology teacher now changed markedly; the methodical businesslike use of the conference disappeared; a more natural give-and-take attitude established itself; she discussed her field experiences and interesting relations of her various academic subjects, and began

to discuss her own perplexities, as an unclassified student and [by March] her plans for future work. Instead of being merely an interested observer in the class, she now talks vividly and eagerly on all occasions. She is not inclined to challenge other people's points of view, but she is willing to argue on such subjects as behavior of nursery school children based on her own observations—the class frequently finds her observations on theoretical matters beside the point.

The teacher noted also that the class “naturally turned to Fern for humor and regarded her observations on field trips and nursery schools as important. In the sense of her own outgoing personality she became a definite force in the group.” The increase of freedom, deepening of interest, and assertion of independence are also reflected in her behavior with reference to projects for this course:

There was a good deal of anxiety in connection with the execution of her first project. She was determined to make a good job of it, because of her record last year. Her second project in Biology is something that will take at least four more weeks to complete. This she is enthusiastic about and seems to feel much less anxiety in connection with it. Her third project—a study of nursery school techniques—is something in which she is vitally interested, and I should say that she is completely free of anxiety in connection with it.

Through the winter and spring of this year she discussed her work and plans with her adviser. While in actual work she seemed to remain dependent on conferences with teachers, needing their approval of almost every step she took and grateful for their stimulation and criticism, she became somewhat more independent in these personal conferences. She appeared to want to talk about her work, her relations with teachers her boy friend, her family, because she is interested—not merely because she must have help in working out difficulties. The details of how education is taking place with this student are perhaps best summarized through the record dictated by this adviser.

After some weeks of observing at the Bronxville School she went to a W.P.A. school. She outlined carefully, and without any question from me, her reasons for wanting to do this. The Bronxville children were all well-cared-for children, and “had plenty of attention anyhow,” and she wanted to see how other children behaved. (It was rather amusing to see in these conversations how much of the technical language of her subject—not deliberately I am sure—she had taken over.) She wanted to see the technique of handling larger numbers. She wanted to see how people without the training of BNS teachers handled the problems that arose. There were so many girls from the college observing at BNS that sometimes they outnumbered the children (this was an exaggeration I am sure), and you felt useless. It was nice to get away from the people you knew—you didn’t have to *worry about what they were thinking or what they wore or what you wore*. I think she had a sense of being of real rather than nominal service at the W.P.A. school, and she later said (as a reason for being there), “If I ever really work in one of these places I ought to know something about all kinds.” It was the first indication that she might

be interested in work of any kind, and the remark came out quite spontaneously.

After some weeks at the W.P.A. school she began to tire of it. It took a great deal of time, she felt that she had learned all she could there, she apparently had no great respect for the teachers there, and, perhaps more important than any of these, she began to feel that she was being exploited—"they're rushed and not very efficient, and they like the free help" was her way of putting it.

Her experiences at the elementary school, in New York, where she next went to observe, were another forward step for her. Here she felt something important was going on, she was free from the constant association with other students (I got all along here the feeling that she was more at ease when other S.L. girls were not present, and that she thought she functioned better), and she had a feeling of responsibility—as though she knew nothing casual or slipshod would do. Her account of her day there when her grandfather had died gives some indication of the distance toward independence this girl had travelled, and of the degree to which the work she does has come to have meaning for her. Her family called her (I believe during the night) to tell her of her grandfather's death, and to have her come home next day.

She had agreed to be at school that day, for the first time to take complete charge of the group—the regular teacher was to be away. She told me about it later—"I thought about it, and I decided to go anyhow. I had never had a chance to run the group, and I wanted to see how I'd handle it when nobody was there for me to ask, and I knew that if I didn't show up, even if I had a good excuse, they wouldn't ask me again, and anyhow there mightn't be the chance again. I knew I couldn't help about grandfather, and I knew it would be bad enough when I did get there, and they were depending on me at the school, so I went. And it was fine. I felt more certain of myself than I ever had, I think because there was nobody there to make me think, 'I wonder what I'm doing wrong now—I wonder what she thinks of this.'"

She has visited nursery schools in her neighborhood, she has growing convictions about them, and she thinks quite differently in terms of keeping some kind of contact with them when she is through here. Her work in psychology has obviously opened up an interest for her which nothing she had last year succeeded in doing. She feels that this is the sort of thing she can and wants to do—and until she found it there was nothing she could feel that way about—even temporarily.

She rarely talked with her adviser about her work in English, though she gave proof of enjoying it and demonstrated strong admiration and affection for the teacher. She appeared to like the feeling of having covered ground and having read a lot of important books. The reading list which her own reports show is indeed impressive, and though the experience of these books and the discussion of them must have remained rather "on the level of performance" than vivid feeling, the teacher's notes indicate a considerable change in attitude during the year: "She has gained in self-confidence and I believe in self-respect. She undoubtedly reads more intelligently, writes much more clearly, and takes an active and valuable part in class. She very rarely raised her voice at the beginning." This teacher's notes amplify further:

She has a marked interest in the useful, as compared with only a moderate interest in principles or abstract ideas. She demonstrates a marked love of people; she has little interest in form, harmony, style, etc., and very slight interest in religious or mystical subject matter. She gained enough confidence to draw conclusions to a marked extent; and she developed a liking for paraphrase in which she enjoyed a feeling of mastery. She is potentially a competent person with no particular interest in information for its own sake. Her six favorite books were *Jane Eyre*; *Good-Bye Mr. Chips*; *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*; *The Monk*; *Dorian Gray*; *Wuthering Heights*.

The high spot of interest in the course centered about a full report to the class on the Brontë sisters, but here, Fern's interest in doing well, in establishing herself in the eyes of the class, was obviously the chief source of excitement. She talks to no other teacher about any of this varied reading, nor does she in any way attempt to connect the books with her own life.

Her third course was history of art, which, according to her adviser's notes on her registration plans, Fern took principally because he gave it. She almost never spoke of her work in this subject and when she did it was to count the number of exhibitions she had been to. At the end of the first half year, when the instructor finished his share of the course,

Fern decided to drop the course and take homemaking instead. When she came in to see her adviser about this she had already gone to one or two classes and had pretty well made up her mind. The adviser writes:

She objected to what she took to be the teacher's take-it-or-leave-it attitude, obviously experiences a recurrence of her fears of the early part of the year and determined not to jeopardize her present position. She was very clear and businesslike about the matter. The first thing she wanted to know was whether changing in the middle of the year would be bad in the eyes of "the college." Then she explained that she had got all she wanted out of the art course—she had gone to a lot of exhibitions; she had learned enough about modern painting to know a Van Gogh from a Picasso; she was now familiar with the names of all the important modern painters and knew something about them and that was enough. She was not interested in architecture—and obviously she was frightened of the teacher. Also she did want to do Homemaking—it was something she ought to know, the girls were through doing the things she wasn't interested in (budgets, study of diets) and were going to learn about marketing—food buying, furniture, china. Again the old refrain—"I think I can do that"—but without the doggedness, and with, instead, an honest desire to examine herself, and to know her limitations and her qualities and to discover a workable field of action for herself. After a meeting or two with the Homemaking group she said, "I've tried it out and that's what I want—I know the girls who are taking it—they're my kind, they can do that kind of work and so can I."

The course presented little challenge and, like many students in this situation, Fern rather did the job with her left hand. But unlike many students she was not in the least confused about the value of the course; she was candid to a point of sharpness with her adviser before the end of it. The remarkable thing about this clear-headedness is that uncertainty about classification toward the end of the year had made her considerably uneasy, yet she was able to continue the free, independent candor with at least three members of the faculty which the assurance of the year's work had established. There was also the fact that a job was offered her. The adviser's notes give the story of this period vividly:

When time came for registration she discussed her problem very cannily. She said, "I do want to come back, but I don't want to and won't if I don't get the diploma this year. If I say I want to come back mightn't that make them say, 'Well, she is coming back anyhow; we'll hold up the diploma until next year!' And if I say I am not coming back they won't consider me for a third year, and I want to be considered."

At the elementary school, her volunteer work was apparently very satisfactory—her teacher received enthusiastic reports about her, and at the end of her work there they asked her if she would be willing to come back next year as a volunteer assistant, for the experience she would get. She was very much pleased by this, of course. Two or three weeks before college ended she heard of an opening as assistant in a nursery school not too far from the college to visit. She applied for the job—"If I don't get asked back I'd like to get the offer." She interviewed the teacher who was to head the group and was sent to see an official who apparently had the last word. Her interview, which she recounted in detail, *was a masterpiece of shrewdness in handling a man* ("he was rather old, about fifty") who was obviously pleased with this smartly-dressed and attractive girl, and who had something she wanted. She got the job. A few days later she was notified that she would get her diploma and that she could come back for a third year. She decided after a good deal of talking about it, and by the advice of her parents as well as on her own inclination, to come back to college and not take the job.

The decision to return to college indicates, perhaps more clearly than anything else during the year, what had happened to Fern. The change in attitude, in the ends for which she strove, from the first to the second year was not a shift in quality or kind, but simply a shift in focus. In her first year she was determined "to make good" with the girls, to have them like her. In the second she is determined to make good with the faculty, to have them respect her, and along with the faculty, of course, her family. She is still dependent upon teachers for approval and encouragement—more so than her teachers would like to see—but this dependence is more intelligently handled and is based upon an increasing trust. There is no incident in the second year to indicate suspicion, resentment, or latent defiance toward her adviser or the teach-

ers with whom she has chosen to work. Even with the girls she is still somewhat self-conscious, though she would have denied this.

In main objectives, there is very little difference between the two years at the beginning and up through the middle of the second year. But at the end there is considerable qualification of her chief ends. The change from a childish to an adult attitude toward her work is marked in child psychology—particularly about the time that she takes up volunteer work in the Elementary School. At the end of the year her attitude toward her parents becomes increasingly objective, and toward her “steady boy friend” it takes on a more mature, thoughtful aspect in regard to the comparative values of immediate marriage versus continuing in college or taking a job, as possible bridges to independence. Finally her decision to return to college almost imperceptibly but profoundly changes the direction of her educational venture. Clearly she is returning not for an A.B. degree or to make good but for what she can get out of work for herself, and for whatever professional preparation she may be able to get for possible future work in nursery school. Though she discusses this with her father it is not in the spirit of dependence upon his wishes; she tells her psychology teacher that he is “apt to value tags” and is surprised when she “wins him over” to her idea of a third year with no formal reward at the end.

Toward the end of the second year, Fern’s adviser had suggested for the prospective third-year program a further course in child psychology entailing work in the Sarah Lawrence Nursery School. She also suggested history or a course in social science. Fern, however, still evidently felt the fear of social theory inherited from her first year’s experiences in “Opinions and Prejudices” and avoided both the latter suggestions. After a good deal of interviewing of teachers and considerable time spent in inquiring about various courses, she signed up for a combination of work in nursery school

and child psychology; for a course in the development of music (largely a training in listening, analysis, and appreciation); and a course that included both modern and ancient literature and was designed for students who had worked chiefly in other areas. Fern had had other literature courses, and the teacher of this particular course was not inclined to make an exception and accept her. In the autumn, however, Fern made several direct attacks and succeeded in persuading the teacher to allow her to try out the course for a couple of weeks. He recognized in a short time that the girl needed precisely the sort of training the course aimed to give and that there were very few items on the reading list which she had previously read.

The year comprised a great deal of work; particularly in child psychology and in literature, though Fern's work sheets for the beginning of the year show a great deal of time given to listening to symphonic music by Beethoven, Mozart, Brahms, Bach and some moderns. She kept up steady preparation for class discussion in psychology and during the first part of the year concentrated on a project concerned with the Children's Theatre which broadened to include music for children after Christmas. This was a fairly ambitious project and was completed, after several revisions, along in February. But before the final revision of this paper she had begun a second project on child development and welfare as handled by the Press. A third project in the late winter and spring consisted of some reading in psychology on the subject of dreams, in which she had become interested; her paper summarized this reading. The last independent work in the course consisted of revision of material on her second-year paper on "The Only Child," for presentation to the group. For this she prepared and carried out questionnaires on five students on the campus. Another paper for class use on "The Child's Room" was also finished and presented. She seems to have carried some work in cooking, as an extra unit not immediately connected with this course, and one or two

other special units of lectures. Her reports on her reading show a very steady pace—much more work than she could possibly have carried during her first year or the first part of her second year. The teacher's reports on her work for the course (short unit classwork in homemaking and conference work continued in child psychology) indicate her increasing independence and steady control of her material. There are a number of illustrations in the teacher's confidential running record of the quality of Fern's interest, the comparative maturity and independence with which she met the problems that arose in this work.

The discussion of this paper led also to further discussion on the importance of the ordinal position of a child in the family from the standpoint of personal development. She commented that she wished that I would discuss in the final unit of the Homemaking course the problems involved in the attachment of a son to his mother and of a daughter to her father. She desired this because she had observed how attached her fiancé had been to his mother. In explaining this attachment she became quite emotional and excited, said how she had dreaded up until about six months ago being the wife of a man who was still in love with his mother, said now what was happening was that her fiancé was beginning to use her as a mother substitute. He was dependent upon her for advice and counsel and approval as he had been upon his mother before her death (this occurred about a year ago). Remarked that her fiancé "besides being the person I love the most, he is my best friend, and I am his." From this she went on to elaborate on this point of view of analyzing the difference between being in love and recognizing that you had a good friend and companion as well as a lover. Showed very good understanding and insight.

The work in music was by no means as successful for Fern as that of her other two courses. It is clear that she was taking the course for cultural benefit; and it is very dubious if the work in the course—the music even—ever really called forth any very strong aesthetic or personal response. She says to another teacher in May that she could not listen to music any longer; her wedding plans and the social activities of an announced engagement were too distracting. "She said that she

doesn't mind doing what 'she can get her teeth into' but she finds it impossible to do this with music." By April she was carrying the work on a level of performance just above the college minimum.

Fern's experience in literature, however, merits some scrutiny because of the nature of the material read and the comparative depth of comprehension and appreciation. The required reading for the class was somewhat over her head at the beginning of the year, but by the middle of the year she appeared to have developed a comprehension that was beyond anything of which she was capable during her first year and considerably beyond any evidence of her appreciative capacity in the literature courses during the second. In October she showed "a considerable amount of penetration into Emma's motives and also the dead provinciality of the village in *Madame Bovary*." She read several plays by Ibsen and Galsworthy, and also *Sons and Lovers*, with appreciation and understanding. But she was blind to the humor of Jane Austen's *Emma*. She had difficulty in summarizing a plot briefly and in distinguishing between important and unimportant pieces of action. Again in January, she showed a good clear perception of people and the family; she compared her own grandmother to Eliza in *Look Homeward, Angel*; was very sympathetic to the main character in *The American Tragedy*; and when reading *Ivan and Peter* identified with both characters. But she again misses the issue in *Ann Veronica* and does not get beyond a dislike of both the heroine and her father. By spring, she was able to pursue certain philosophical questions in Plato's *The Phaedo* and *The Apology* with a clear grasp of practically all of the main points. During the year she had read almost twenty important novels and twenty major plays and long poems with a level of understanding on the whole far ahead of what had been characteristic of her second year.

Before one closes the story of Fern's three years, it would

be well to attempt to summarize what further changes in attitude, what possible deepening sense of values and increase of the capacity for objective thought may have occurred during this third year over the second. It is clear from the records that Fern did not find any well-marked channel of intellectual interest beyond those problems presented by the study of child psychology and the actual handling of children. Ethical problems in very specific form—situations—appealed to her in literature, and literature also stimulated her sense of humor and her sympathy for an increasing variety of human beings. But neither scientific, theoretical nor aesthetic interest was awakened in this student by her college experience. What then could it be said her education consisted in—merely the accumulation of information about useful and genteel subjects and about people? Perhaps this is enough. But there is also evidence of an increase in power to perceive and to evaluate within the areas of personal interests and ambitions.

The teacher of child psychology reports:

Fern believes that she has changed tremendously since she came here; she attributes her change in broadness of viewpoint and tolerance largely to the fact that during her first year she took a course called *Opinions and Prejudices*. She said she was forced into this course—she did not want it. Said that she never liked the course or the teacher but she learned more from it than from any single course. Remarked that she was so antagonistic toward the instructor she was determined, when she had conferences, to say nothing and be as negative as possible to all suggestions. "After six weeks of doing no work other than class assignments, my teacher was determined that I would do a study on Jews so as to get over my prejudice about them, and I did. I spent my time in the library, neglecting two other courses, and when I presented the paper in class I had many footnotes to document everything I said. I was determined that my teacher would not be able to catch me up on any points; her methods worked because now Jews are my best friends."

When asked whether she changed her point of view about her teacher, she commented, "Last year we talked to each other, and

were extra polite. You know that feeling when you hold a door open for a person when you would really like to slam it in his face." Such honesty is not too common among students.

Her detachment in regard to her family had gained enormously through the three years; her references to them are filled with humor during the latter part of this year.

It seems fair to conclude that Fern had gained a good deal in perception in certain areas—in dealing with children and with people and with family—and that she was a good deal more free to think objectively in regard to activities concerned with them. On the other hand, she seems not to have gained a great deal outside of this; her memory of what happened to her in the first year, although containing poetic truth, is actually not very accurate nor her judgment probably very correct. She is able to perceive the whole of a book more clearly, and she is able to get a good many principal ideas, but these do not become a part of her general knowledge or her point of view; in any intellectual sense she has no point of view.

Perhaps her greatest gain—and this accounts for what many of her teachers regarded as her balance or maturity—is the increasing shrewdness about her own capacities and limitations. This self-knowledge is by no means merely negative; there are things she knows she dislikes and can't do, but there are a great many things she knows she can do; and she lives by doing rather than reflecting or daydreaming. Perhaps this is the foundation of valuable education—at least of education for living.

Summary

Fern is a girl who attended to first things first like a good executive. Since her relations with other girls were of chief importance, in her freshman year they occupied her attention until satisfaction in them had been achieved. The next year she tackled the faculty with equal effectiveness. As a study of interests the result is important; effective work and

indeed quite a real interest emerged from a plan of her second year that was thoroughly opportunistic in its conception. As a study of student guidance of faculty it is unique.

TEST RECORD FOR FERN

PRE-COLLEGE RECORD

Name of Test

Otis Intelligence: IQ, 118

Advanced Standards of Achievement: IQ, 112

Terman: Score, 98; IQ, 100

COLLEGE RECORD

American Council on Education

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
Completion	19	Analogies	8
Arithmetic	7	Opposites	26
Artificial Language	34	Gross Score	12

Bernreuter Personality Inventory

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
B1-N	10	B4-D	89
B2-S	52	F1-C	7
B3-1	12	F2-S	25

INSIGHT WITHOUT PERSISTENT

GOALS: PRISCILLA

THE FOUR YEARS of college work which followed Priscilla's entrance were not only successful but closed with a distinguished record so far as college achievement can be measured. On a scale of one to five, representing Negligible, Poor, Moderate, Good, Excellent, Priscilla's record can be summarized in the following form:

<i>Course</i>	Dec.	Mar.	June	Jan.	Apr.	June	Feb.	Mar.	June	Feb.
Creative Writing	4-	3+	4							
Introduction to Psychology	5	5	4							
Human Biology	4-	4+								
General Biology		4+	4							
Psychology				4	5	5-				
Modern Problems through the Novel				5-	5-	5-				
Short Story Writing				3+	3+	3				
Philosophy							5	5	5	
Comparative Religion							5	5-	5-	
Historical Changes in Music I							4	5	4	
Social Psychology										5+
Special Reading										5
Anthropology										5

The descriptive reports on the student's work present a picture even more superlative than the above. By December in the first year her capacity for steady application is noted by the psychology teacher along with a "strong interest" and "fine observation." In the report on science her intelligence and industry are remarked upon; in the report on writing, her ability to take criticism and achieve constructive revision is noted, as well as her vitality and the substantial quality of her creative sketches, her unusual critical sense in reading, her keen sense of the value of detail. By April her interest in

testing, verifying, classifying, and interpreting suggests to the psychology teacher that she will be capable of following independent research. The science teacher finds she has increased the precision of her observation and is doing outstanding work in the laboratory. Her instructor in creative writing notes that she has tightened her rather loose organization of critical papers and has developed a fair sense of structure in stories, again praising her productivity and her sense of detail.

In the second year her work in creative writing drops in quality but the reports continue to stress her intelligent use of experience and background for experiments in writing. In spite of the fact that Priscilla writes only one fine story during the year, "a number of others may be counted as profitable experiments," and her critical work remains unusually good. In a course in literature stressing social problems, she was inclined to be irregular both in attendance and in participation in class; she also tended to take on huge jobs for papers which had to be rather mechanically organized. But the reports indicate that spurts of energy produced "work of excellent quality" and the student is praised for a consistent "interest in straightening out the framework of her ideas" and for a notable "broadening of her social point of view." Her last written work in this course shows a marked gain in organization, a depth of intellectual and emotional reflection, and an increasing compactness in expression.

In her third year, she tried a course in the history of music, though she considered herself almost tone deaf. The reports indicate a steady growth in ability to hear and to analyze musical structure and effect. She was found remarkably observant, responsive, and always well prepared; her strides, considering her slight natural musical aptitude, brought increased confidence and the recommendation from her instructor that in the following year she continue with work in the direction of intensive musical analysis.

Through her third and fourth years of work in anthropology,

philosophy, and psychology she is consistently praised. Phrases such as "systematic, intelligent, critical, and conscientious" characterize the descriptive reports. Other superlatives abound: "very able . . . more mature than most girls . . . intellectual and emotional poise . . . her mind a well-controlled instrument, as good a student as I have ever had . . . not only diligent in acquiring data but cuts through to underlying problems . . . draws significant points from reading and summarizes skillfully, remains objective, tolerant and cooperative in group discussion . . . often keeps group discussion on the point . . . capacity to synthesize . . . to relate data to theoretical principles."

The final reports at the close of her college career repeat these superlatives. The teachers all agree that Priscilla is remarkable not only for her ability to acquire and organize information but for her insight and her intrepid intellectual curiosity. As one of them says: "She is equally at home with abstractions and with personalities"; she accomplishes long, solid pieces of work with remarkable poise; her manner is pleasant, relaxed, and unassuming; her charm had been remarked by all her faculty throughout the four years.

While the adjective "brilliant" is never used of Priscilla's work, the reports build up an impression of substantial quality far beyond that of the average college student. This, together with the mature judgment displayed by her oral and written work as well as her charm, her quiet humor, and her forthright courage in the face of disturbing facts, fills out a portrait of an ideal college student. She appears to be using her educational opportunities in the wisest, most constructive ways possible for her. For this reason it has seemed worth while to attempt to examine and to some extent reconstruct the motivation behind these successful years of learning; to recapture, if possible, the growing sense of direction in the mind of such a student and to suggest, at least, an evaluation of this educational experience.

The few records of Priscilla's first interviews with faculty

indicate a girl with a great deal of quiet charm and a slow, thoughtful attitude. She was interested in economics, biology, and psychology; she considered herself "a practical person" and wanted to know what these subjects or others could do for her. She was deliberate about her choices and willing to talk with a number of faculty until she had reached a clear decision as to what was best for her program. "A flair for writing," noted by her mother and also at the boardingschool, had been mentioned on the admission forms. Priscilla herself did not refer to it, but did decide "to try" a course in creative writing along with biology and a course in psychology designed particularly for freshmen. It is through the records kept by the teachers of this course and of creative writing that we can derive a fuller comprehension of how Priscilla used her opportunities and what underlying motives formed her interests.

The admissions material also offers more than a little indication of the girl's natural aptitude for college work. For example, she had never definitely disliked a subject of study in school. She did not "enjoy" Latin particularly, but almost everything else—even mathematics—she found enjoyable because it developed "accuracy and concentration." Such a remark could mean just nothing at all, or it could mean a great deal. It was soon evident from her work in science and in psychology and from the sharp specific detail in her writing that Priscilla really did enjoy developing "accuracy and concentration." She had said that she found it easy to express herself in writing but that it was more difficult for her to express herself orally: she required "time to stop and think." She said also that she studied "entirely by fixing the pages, not by ear" and that she found it "very difficult to fully appreciate lectures" unless she took "very full notes." Not only did these observations prove quite true as evidenced by her work during the first term, but they indicated powers of observation already developed. Natural aptitude for college work of the sort she chose to follow she certainly had, but this

fact explains only a small part of the success of Priscilla's first two years of college education.

More important is the fact that her reasons for coming to college were more specific, perhaps more mature, than those of many other students. Among them are some of the usual statements about broad-mindedness and the development of judgment and the idea of learning to adapt herself "to the whole social world outside of college." But she says she wants more than this, specifically: "I want college to teach me more how to understand particular individuals; to work from the part to the whole." This reference to the specific rather than the general is unusual in freshman forms; in Priscilla's case, it undoubtedly arose from particular situations which she felt she must understand. Further, she has an urge to encounter philosophical questions; she "would like to acquire as nearly as possible a clear conception of the real meaning of the word 'life' and how I can contribute my share to the world around me." Her reference to the kind of training she wants is interesting in connection with this philosophical interest: she speaks of academic training as cultivating "powers of reception and discrimination." This part of her application is much more analytical than is the case with most students; it contains none of the usual moralizing which many applicants pick up in their secondary-school training.

The admissions material contained two other facts which proved to be very important in any comprehension of what the girl was driving toward. Her father, who died before she was thirteen, had been a physician and something of a scientist; a paternal uncle was also a scientist. Her interest in biology seems to have been partly stimulated by these facts and by the desire, as she later remarked to one teacher, to prove to her uncle that the weaker sex could show themselves professionally adequate.

Another important item on the admissions questionnaire was Priscilla's answer to the question, "Have you had to face any difficult problems? Tell us as much about them as you

think we ought to know if we are to understand you and help you plan to your best advantage." She wrote with characteristic modesty:

My only problems have been family problems. My mother has been on the verge of a nervous collapse for six years and family life is rather difficult. Our temperaments are all so entirely different that each of us often lacks the proper understanding of the other's worries. My greatest problem is to be tolerant and understanding and cease to look on nerve sickness with the so-called "hardness of youth."

Perhaps the most significant thing about Priscilla's motives for her whole four years of college is that when she uses the term "understanding" she does not mean merely tolerance or sympathy, she means "understanding" in the full sense of the term.

The desire to understand soon appears as a primary motive in psychology. As early as November, the teacher notes that Priscilla

wanted to study the psychology of nervous people. She would intermittently come back to this topic which I deliberately overlooked for a while in order to test out the intensity behind this drive. It was pointed out to her that the study of ordinary everyday children in a set-up like a nursery school was an essential preliminary to the study of the sort she had in mind.

After considerable observation in nursery schools, including W.P.A. nursery schools, in which Priscilla was one of the most actively interested, she reached the conclusion herself that the effect of family influence on dependent and independent habits of young children might be a possible area of observation for her to follow. Before Christmas she again returned to the topic of the study of nervous people adding that "it was in the family," but the teacher was still unconvinced that the girl was ready to discuss fully her personal problems in relation to the family situation. He responded with the countersuggestion that she take an autobiography as the subject of a long paper desired by her writing teacher in connection

with the work in psychology. Priscilla considered the project but decided against it, because she did "not feel like being frank about many things." She agreed however to try a "life history" of some individual in her home community whom she could study during her vacation.

Following this vacation there was a marked slump in her work. She confessed that she found it difficult to get back in the swing. She did not do the life-history-study of a character in her home community. She tried to work up some enthusiasm by putting a great deal of energy into certain field trips and wrote a long paper on Heredity and Environment, instead of the autobiography. By the middle of February it became clear that she had to talk about "the psychology of nervousness." She led up to this by fluctuating suggestions for projects which were not fulfilled: such as writing a paper on the nervous system, doing some medical work in connection with children—something like "putting thermometers in their mouths," as she said. Finally, the psychology teacher allowed her to talk. The problem particularly preying on her mind concerned her relation to her mother and younger brother, or more precisely the brother's relation to her mother on the one hand and to herself on the other. This had been suggested in an early autobiographical paper but it was now fully discussed over a period of weeks in relation to the general family situation and to possible study which Priscilla might follow. It was suggested that there was probably no "immediate or easy" solution of such problems. The principal difficulty confronting her was the "question of her assuming leadership in the regulating of family matters of great urgency." There is, of course, no record of the detail of these conversations, nor the facts involved; there is merely the outline; but it is unmistakably clear from the records of Priscilla's reading that her determination to clarify these problems and patiently to acquire knowledge helpful toward their solution became the principal motive for work in this field over the rest of her freshman year and into her second

year. For example, the following passage from the teacher's record is to the point:

in reporting the activities of a child she has been studying for some time now, in the nursery school, Priscilla shows herself well disposed to tie up the factor of family constellation with the child's activities in the nursery school. Other "interests" in specific projects have been clearly defined in terms of her preoccupation with her mother and younger brother. Her tremendous interest in case history methods, in life histories and her interest in theoretical reading connected with the class discussion (though very little had been assigned in this freshman course) all were evidence of what she needed to be interested in. . . . All roads of the learning process . . . lead her to her little emotional Rome.

The psychology teacher insisted in interview that Priscilla had never appeared neurotic to him. The "projection" of her personal problems into her work was a normal objectifying of actual difficulties. After all, these were very real problems and the degree of responsibility already forced on Priscilla by circumstance was considerably beyond that ordinarily placed on an eighteen-year-old girl of similar background. Priscilla was quite conscious not only of the problems themselves but of their complexity and their relation to her own attitudes. The degree of her awareness is indeed remarkable; her capacity for sharp observation, for acquiring facts, had already become noticeable in an analysis of certain case-history materials.

In spite of the slump, Priscilla managed a good deal of work in writing; by the end of January she had written one long essay and planned another serious paper on Science and Religion, which she seemed determined to outline, at least, in order to get clear her opinions on these subjects. She had kept up a fine bluff of cheerfulness for the teacher in writing—so good that one finds the note in this record, "seems to have no personal problems—except perhaps her health." At this time it is interesting to observe that her tendency toward verbosity, "obscuring her meaning with words," had increased, but organization of material had definitely improved.

By the middle of March, after the conferences on home problems had begun with the psychology teacher, there is a slight gain in compactness of expression. The result of the paper on Science and Religion was that Priscilla got a great sense of satisfaction from having defined issues which must have had for her a good deal of emotional value. "Of course the subject was too big for adequate treatment," notes the writing teacher, "but . . . the result is that she now knows where she stands and why, at what points she can support her opinions, and at what points she needs more evidence."

The two long essays, Heredity and Environment and Science and Religion, seemed to have fulfilled two purposes. Priscilla had turned her attention to these serious topics during the period of tension before and after Christmas, when she was gradually coming to the conclusion that she must talk to the psychology teacher about the difficult family situation. The critical activity of concentrating on these theoretical and less directly emotional questions seemed to give her a certain amount of satisfaction, perhaps by defining issues which hung on the border line of feeling and thought. She seemed to have been unable to write fiction at this time. The second value to her lay in the fact that this critical writing helped her control the tendency toward verbosity. When she took up writing creative sketches later in May, the writing teacher commented, "Her style gains in compactness." At this time she wrote one of her best stories—about a Cajun boy acceptable neither to whites nor blacks—which had charm and pathos.

During the long period of late winter and early spring she seems to have put more energy into biology than into writing or psychology. Perhaps the fact that this work had no connection whatever with human motives and morals may have been valuable to Priscilla at the time. On the other hand, she seems at no point in her college life to have attempted to avoid any moral or psychological problems, but rather to have sought them out and to have enjoyed the intellectual

tussle they offered. Though her work in biology gained steady praise during this term and though she was proud of a success that brought her a recommendation to the summer laboratory at Woods Hole (she was the only freshman recommended), she did not register for more science in the late spring. Both her writing teacher and her psychology teacher comment on the success of her work in science and her pride in the honor of recommendation to the summer laboratory. They even quote her as planning to work at Woods Hole during the summer. But her own registration for the autumn program does not include biology.

So far as one can learn Priscilla never gave anyone very specific reasons for this decision. She was asked about it two years later. She made precisely the same reply she had made at the time she registered: "Oh I've had enough of that; it's been fine, but I've had enough." One recalls her remark to the psychology teacher that she had wanted to prove to her scientific uncle that she could attain a level of professional competence in science. May it not be that she recognized this motive as operating in her choice of biology in college and regarded it as satisfied by the achievement of recommendation to the summer laboratory? Perhaps, however, because of her serious reading in psychology, she decided that biology was not worth following further because it was not as rationally justified as other motives. Perhaps she went through none of this reasoning, but simply followed an intuitive preference for another kind of work. The other kind of work was literature—a course with a strong emphasis upon social problems as its distinctive characteristic.

In this course Priscilla read a group of novels concerned with problems of personal development as a common theme, then a group of novels on family life. By the middle of the year she was reading fiction heavy in social, economic, and political questions; she finally concentrated on a study of Fascism and Communism which, like her earlier study of Science and Religion, was much too large in scope, but gave

her a means of clarifying and defining her opinions. She had also written reviews of many of the novels read. By Christmas, in creative writing she had written four short stories; then a long story, and then several more experiments with story plots as well as analyses of certain distinguished stories. But neither she nor the teachers of these courses regarded this work as steady or very clearly directed. She worked in cycles marked by spurts of energy. In quantity, however, her work compares very well with other members of these classes.

Priscilla's potential qualities were so manifest to all her faculty that the standards applied in judging her work were inevitably higher than those applied in judging the work of other students. The striking thing in both these courses appears to be that Priscilla grew less and less interested in the technique of writing as such and more and more interested in problems of moral and cultural life. She was quite obviously not interested in the final form of the essays she worked over, nor particularly interested in the form at all. She was very much interested in the development of her own opinions in regard to a great many general questions; she was experimenting with her own thinking and taking a tally every so often by way of a paper—it didn't matter how broad or general the scope; she was using the academic tasks as compass readings on her voyage.

Part of her experimental attitude came, perhaps, from her readings in psychology, which she had continued with the same instructor. She continued her study of underprivileged minority groups, the economic problems connected with them, and particularly the psychological problems concerned with the Negro and the Jew. Dollard's *Caste and Class in a Southern Town* made a powerful impression on her and motivated several months' work along lines suggested by it. She now had a series of conferences with a teacher of anthropology whose book on aspects of race was very relevant to her study. She discovered that the study of anthropology was essentially the study of cultures and found it

particularly pertinent to a great many things she was carrying unsolved in her mind. She discussed the nature of anthropology with the psychology teacher and was encouraged in a half-formed desire to go into this field by his suggestion that the field was particularly open to women of her economic competence and background. She was now able to trace clearly some of the sources of her own interest and excitement in the topics of minority groups and race. She alluded to a period in childhood when she was suddenly and (so far as she could then see) unreasonably forbidden to play any longer with Negro playmates, who had been the most intimate of her early companions. The prohibition had operated, she thought, as a kind of trauma, and left with her a sense of mystery and wrong, dictated by capricious forces that she could not comprehend. The death of her own father, and later, that of her stepfather and the friction and disapproval of the maternal and paternal clans may also have had their share in developing the capacity of sympathy for and interest in the problems of the underprivileged.

She had carried on her strong interest in the life-history method discovered in her first year's work. The effects of some of this reading is clearly discernible in her creative writing. Yet only one of her sketches during the year proved successful. This was a story of a Negro girl who strangles her husband's seducer. In spite of the melodramatic plot the story is made real by the vivid detail, the authenticity of the background, and by the suggestion of depth and understanding of the cultural forces at work on the characters. The candor and violence are almost unbelievable in the work of a girl with Priscilla's privileged background, while the underlying pathos and maturity are unusual in creative work of a young woman of nineteen. The literary craftsmanship, however, is not masterful and no better than "good."

It is interesting that this story, with its violence of fantasy and physical detail, should have been written at a time when Priscilla's concern with family problems had reached

a point of exasperation. Her mother's condition had greatly improved in the autumn; there was even the prospect of remarriage which, Priscilla had told the psychology teacher, she was very eager to see occur. But during the winter obstacles had arisen and a very discouraging relapse in her mother's condition had revived many of the earlier difficulties. It was at this time that suggestions from the psychology teacher concerning the importance of "objectifying" emotional difficulties brought some practical help to Priscilla. She devised certain plans for diverting her mother's attention from the distressing egocentric problems and watched these plans somewhat improve the nervous condition. In considering such suggestions and the principle behind them she came better to understand the uses she herself was making of her intellectual adventures. She found not only a new justification for the study of psychology and anthropology but began to discriminate between certain types of study in relation to her own moods and impulses.

At the end of her first year in college Priscilla had taken a Rorschach test; it was interpreted by an expert outside the college who had no knowledge of Priscilla or her college work other than that gained from the test itself. The interpretation appears to offer some explanation of the facts already summarized concerning her inner anxieties and her outward superlative achievements during her first year, though perhaps in a more dramatic overtone than the records convey. It also suggests the very objectification or sublimation discussed above as a desirable and possibly constructive aim. The interpretation is as follows:

At the moment, Priscilla is under the influence of an experience which, for her, is very intense, indeed. She is so completely dominated by the latter that she is veritably dependent on the emotional forces involved. All of her striving is directed toward taking herself in hand, i.e., in carrying on so well with respect to the demands of life that others will not be struck with the extent to which she is emotionally involved. For this reason, in her performance of tasks, she functions with such automatic vigor that in

this state her own emotional life is lived out with her overheated feelings.

A factor that is interesting and peculiar to her character structure, is the power that an experience can exert on her; she is compelled to abandon herself to it completely even to the point of impotence. She submits completely to superior powers, fears the resultant dependence and yet feels so drawn to these powers that she can't break loose even if she would like to. Because of the fact that every avenue of escape from this state of affairs is shut off, her capacity for experience has suffered a certain restriction. Thus her life is always centered about her own self without her experiencing a real inner growth or inner enrichment. It is the strength of this experience that imprisons her and allows her no release. Her intellect is placed entirely at the service of self-discipline as a protective device to prevent an unendurable bursting forth of her conflicts in feelings. On this account she is not able to be as productive in her work as her genuine intellectual potentialities would indicate. She takes flight without much effort in routine work; she is easily overfatigued, often depressed and frequently clings to her emotional dependency because of a terror at making any independent decision. This all tends to make her more and more passive and less and less free.

It seems to me that it would be of considerable help to her if she could incorporate an objective problem with her personal conflict and if she could learn to recognize her own problem in a broader and more objective light so that her emotions would be endowed with a more buoyant energy. It is necessary that she open the barriers between her personal world and her accomplishments and cease treating these, as she has until now, like two separate spheres.

Instead, she should try to objectify her own problem and to make it more fruitful in order to emerge from her own cramped circle. Work can make her more free and independent and it can open the way to liberating her from a state of mind where everything is always grasped from one central point. She will then be made objectively and emotionally aware of the manifoldness of human problems—their contradictions and breadth—and also their fruitful possibilities.

We have already noted that the psychology teacher discussed with Priscilla the need for objectifying problems in the spring of her first year, and the matter was more fully

discussed during the following year. It is obvious that Priscilla made penetrating and intelligent use of this knowledge in reference to herself; the cycles of energy and the uneven spurts of work during the second year may be to some extent understood as indicating her experimental period in the unfolding of self-knowledge.

Priscilla was greatly aided in the attempt to keep herself free from anxiety during this troubled second year by the appearance on the scene in late winter of a new young man. She was soon very much in love and found what she called the more "introverted" study, involving theoretical reading and book research, becoming for the first time almost impossible. Instead of growing worried about her work she talked to the psychology teacher of taking on more field investigation and active observation; she seemed able to derive both pleasure and results from what she called this "extraverted" type of work. Her work in literature and in creative writing was suffering from delay and absence. But toward late spring she pulled herself together to undertake a long and laboriously organized paper. The real benefit brought by the spring love affair seems to have been the decision to return to college for the next year—perhaps for the A.B. which, up to this time, had been considered unlikely. The motive, as she herself laughingly admitted, was probably the desirability of being this far North and this much nearer the new young man.

As early as December in her second year Priscilla's adviser (the teacher of creative writing) wrote in her regular report:

I hope next year she will return to Natural Science, since her talents seem to lie in that direction, though both Literature and Writing are increasingly important to her, and Psychology has been invaluable. Of family problems she has her share and heavier responsibilities than a girl of her age should carry, but she seems able to cope with them. At least they are not impeding her progress here. I think, however, that she particularly needs a normal good time with other young people, and that I, as her don, am doing most for her when I sign her week-end slips.

As one looks back over the records of the second year, it is rather obvious that the week ends, though they provided a normal good time and even discovered a "young man," were not the most important of her experiences. Along with the study in psychology leading to the discovery of what her intellectual experience could mean to her, it was the slight acquaintance with anthropology and its approach to human problems that appear to have been of greatest significance to Priscilla. The adviser, writing in December, could scarcely foresee the influences operating on Priscilla's thought during the winter and spring months and hence could not predict the extent to which Priscilla was to change her direction of study in plans for the coming year.

Priscilla did not go back to "Natural Science"; she did not go back to anything or anybody she had worked with before. She registered for a completely new program: anthropology, a conference course in philosophy, and a course in music which was experimental for her. Her new adviser, a faculty member with whom she had not worked before, was a friend of a family she knew intimately (in the North). He was a friendly, detached, humorous kind of person, who asked few questions yet was ready to talk about anything from sealing wax to kings. He had a lively interest in intellectual matters, particularly matters which touched upon human behavior, life, and environment. There is no record of her receiving any advice at all concerning the new program. The adviser recalls that Priscilla's decision concerning it was already made when she first saw him. He merely approved it with his signature.

The program and the change of adviser fulfill what appears to be a sudden turn toward a new life. She has given up writing, definitely, as an aim; she has turned from natural science to the apparently more exciting field of human relations already studied through social and psychological reading; she makes a gesture toward new experience in one of the arts; she acquires an adviser through common friends outside the college and doubtless through her roommate who

there was too little humanity in it. She also said she had really wanted to write, but discovered that she was not good enough at it; the further she went the stronger her sense of inferiority grew, so she made up her mind to drop it. She had much the same feeling about literature as a further subject of study; she did not find a natural sense of competence in dealing with questions of aesthetic criticism. Moreover, as she went on with reading in philosophy she became increasingly aware that what interested her in reference to science on the one hand and literature on the other was the problem of how these areas of knowledge fitted into the larger scheme of human values. She was interested in what part science had played in changing and developing the concept of reality; she was interested in what aspects of human or emotional values literature could illuminate and clarify.

She was not very happy at the moment: to the teacher of philosophy she seemed to have a less successful social life than other girls close to her; the love affair had evidently not gone too well. But there are no records of personal details. The strong impression gained from conferences through the first part of this third year in philosophy was that Priscilla suffered a good many depressions and was seeking something like a "tragic sense of life" for a philosophical objectification of her prevailing attitude. Something in *Marius the Epicurean* began to define this for her and she found it again toward the end of the year in Santayana's *Last Puritan*; both books seemed to become peculiarly important to her and to light up a good many areas of reflection which had remained in shadow. By the end of the year this somber state of mind had passed; she was happier; her sense of direction for further study was more certain. She was quite willing in March to take a Rorschach test for a second time; she was interested in experimental work of the sort. The analysis and interpretation of the test was made "blind" by a second expert outside the college. The result is in marked contrast to that of the test made two years earlier. It is hard to believe that the change

was entirely due to the difference in interpreter or to the fact that the first was given by the interpreter and the second was analyzed "blind." The change in the girl is fairly manifest in the records as summarized to date; the increased detachment toward family problems; the success of sublimation or objectification of inner tensions has been stressed. The analysis of the Rorschach protocol was received in April and is as follows:

This record does not contain any conspicuous deviations from records of young women of superior intelligence and higher education. The subject gave 37 responses in 20 minutes; the average time per response is very short, being .54'.

The student seems to expend more of her psychic energy in direct emotional contact with the environment than in the development of an inner life. The scale of her emotions seems to be a wide one, with nuances of feeling. Her affectivity is lively. Her first reactions would tend to be rather impulsive and labile, soon, however, assuming an intensity and quality which are socially acceptable. The emotional reactions are not only genuinely experienced, but seem to lead to actions and to a desire to express the feeling in rather adequate conduct. The student seems to be quite aware of her emotional behavior and, if necessary, seems to be capable of a well controlled and guarded conduct. She is probably tactful and considerate of others.

Her fundamental attitude toward life seems to be an active one. It appears, however, that the student expects some obstacles in her enterprises. Although she does not appear to be submissive, she tends to be aware of the difficulties one is bound to encounter in carrying out one's undertakings. She does not seem to be possessed of a great desire to achieve. In fact, she seems to do most things for the fun of it rather than for purposes of strengthening her prestige in the group. The instinctual drive does not seem to be strong.

The student seems to be endowed with sound common sense. She is not given to generalizing or to speculative thinking but, on the other hand, she does not lose herself in unessential details. She seems to be in good contact with reality and to possess all the capacities for a well adjusted and happy life. From the standpoint of maturity, her effectivity seems to be somewhat too labile and self-centered, but this is a trait which is to be found in the vast majority of young college women and is probably to be attrib-

uted to the age factor. On the basis of the Rorschach, it might be expected that her performance and general conduct are even, with only very rare occasions during which for emotional reasons her level of performance seems to drop. The student appears to be a person who would respond to sympathetic encouragement and whose achievement can be stimulated emotionally.

At about the time of the second test, Priscilla had defined more sharply what it was she was interested in. The rather vague desire to understand more of "the meaning of things" had become specific enough for her adviser to say,

Her guiding idea . . . is a desire to learn about people—both inhabitants of a world in which she must live, and as proper studies in themselves. . . . She will not be an "intellectual," but a well-informed layman; and the productive thing for her next year will be further extension of her experience in the social sciences, rather than deep digging in a small area.

He recommends for her program anthropology, advanced work in psychology (to continue and supplement her earlier work in the psychology of personality); literature, if she can find a course dealing with general ideas rather than specifically "literary values," or a more advanced course in "straight philosophy"; physiology was also suggested as a possible alternative. He adds, "She feels time is short and much is to be learned."

At the end of April, Priscilla registered for anthropology, psychology, and philosophy conference. The last-named was arranged as a compromise between the suggestion of "straight philosophy" and literature; she was to work out her reading partly in literature and partly in philosophical material. The course in anthropology had a more specific psychological and social orientation than the work of the previous year. The psychology course would take up various modern theories of personality, Freud, Jung, Adler, Gestalt, Lewin, and so on, and then proceed to experimental field studies in group attitudes, mental testing, and possibly studies of race attitudes in specific communities near enough to the college for field investigation.

The summer brought no change in these plans. The family problems, so troubling during the first two years, appear somewhat improved, though it is difficult to be certain of this. She had so fully learned to face them and so thoroughly understood her own attitude that she does not need to discuss them with any one of her faculty after about the middle of her third year. She returns to work in the autumn of her fourth year with great energy; her mother remarries during the winter of this year and Priscilla herself becomes engaged during the early spring. It is not clear in the records whether or not the fiancé is the same person who shone on the horizon of her second year.

The literary and philosophical reading of her fourth year is particularly interesting in reference to the development of Priscilla's attitudes. She begins with Gilson's *Breakdown of Modern Philosophy* and William James's *Reasoning*. From this she proceeds on the one hand to Hegel's logic and on the other to Russell's *Free Man's Worship*. At this point she seeks literary material relevant to Gilson's theme; decides to read Proust and does so. During December and January she completes a paper on Proust built upon a good deal of critical reading concerning him. Before she is through with this exercise in definition, she decides in conference discussions with the teacher that she would like to return to her enthusiasm of the previous year, Santayana, whose *Last Puritan* had seemed to hold so much for her. But she also suggests that she would like to work on Santayana in reference to one or two of the past systems of philosophical thought which she had superficially encountered the year before. She thus reviews Spinoza at the suggestion of the teacher, reads twelve of Santayana's essays, long and short, and then turns to a careful review of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*.

Priscilla did not write a paper on Santayana; she made notes and an outline for discussion. In May she proceeded to arrange conferences with another instructor who had particu-

larly specialized in the study of Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Spengler, and Thomas Mann. She was interested in the link between reading for anthropology and Spengler's theories, also in the later extension of the German idealism in the work of Nietzsche and Mann. But she is not carried away by either of these authors; she maintains a calm, intrepidly curious detachment. Her prevailing attitude toward idealism of almost any kind during these last months may be characterized by her remarks to the philosophy teacher during a discussion of the European situation. Human life must be lived, she said, it is better to live even a limited kind of life than to die for a cause. During the year she had been profoundly moved only by Russell's *Free Man's Worship* and by parts of Proust, not however by the social satire in Proust. She had never particularly responded to satire, although she was well aware of snobbery.

Priscilla's work in theoretical and social psychology developed both critical perception and actual technical skill in dealing with people and background foreign to her own; she was immensely successful in interviewing individuals, Negroes, Jews, and a variety of underprivileged nationalities in a near-by suburb. She was also successful in meeting with clubs or groups of young people organized by a social agency and in carrying out a program of mental testing on a co-operative basis with them. Her range of capacity, reaching from theoretical to practical investigation, was also illustrated by her work in anthropology.

At the beginning of the year she began to work on Trobriand culture, notes the teacher in this field. The suggestion stemmed from work on the adjacent Dobuan people . . . the preceding year. She covered with care and precision at least five of Malinowski's volumes on the area. Some of the implications of the Malinowski material led her into an examination of Freudian theory of personality structure and social development. During this period she showed unusual ability in correlating her contract readings and classwork as well as unusual power in creative speculation and self-criticism.

Later in the year, having become interested in the possibility of excavation of certain traces of Indian civilization on property owned by her family near her home, she made preparations for a "dig," taking measurements and interviewing authorities. Through the teacher, the authorities in a Northern university were approached and plans were made for field work during the summer. The project was abandoned because of complications in state political offices and because of illness in her own family. Further notes from records of the teacher in anthropology are illustrative of Priscilla's capacity in this field; they reveal her attitude toward the future.

Priscilla has shown no marked dislike for any intellectual problem. I suspect that she has no interest in aesthetic expression or appreciation.

Her forte is analysis and above all integrating new data to past information which she herself has acquired. She shows a singular skill in evaluation and interrelation. This is combined with unusual self-discipline and patience in accumulating data.

When I have made criticism of her work I felt she neither under or over-weighted it.

Considering Priscilla's general superiority to the other students in the class she showed singularly little need to assert her superiority. In the matter of obligations she is responsible, but not obsessively so. One factor was inconsistent in Priscilla's general intellectual superiority and that was her inability to challenge class interests during her oral reports. She did not "fire" the group as less adequate students did.

She said she planned to marry and live in the South: that she felt a purely domestic and social life would not be entirely satisfying, and that she wanted an amateur outlet, preferably academic. She seemed to be evaluating the future with emotional and intellectual poise.

The year Priscilla graduated, all the seniors receiving the A.B. were asked to interview one of the faculty concerning college problems, in order to obtain criticism and comment on the college resulting from the students' experience. As might be expected Priscilla's interview showed unusual maturity; her replies were thoughtful.

One of the chief things that college accomplished for a girl was to relate her learning to the outside world: "From the point of view of the wider significance, it is good, regardless of whether the students sell at Macy's afterwards or not." Looking back over her college course she felt that the most valuable experiences in it were

the opportunities of being able to talk with your contemporaries, the faculty, widening your scope that way; . . . being able to express my own opinion as a person, not as a recitation. Secondly, the fact that here you are able to take up work which you think interests you and which you can follow through, being able to work with it as your particular work. It has nothing to do with the class; you are able to take up any aspect of it.

From this the questions swung back to "Interests" with the directly personal question: "When did you find your main interest?" The dialogue follows:

Priscilla: Last year; I limited it to one particular field last year. I was always interested in Psychology and Philosophy. That led me to a further study of mankind, comparative religions, anthropology.

Questioner: You feel, looking back, that this was soon enough?

Priscilla: Amazingly enough, everything I have studied led toward that.

Questioner: You would not then be in favor of having to choose toward the end of the second year?

Priscilla, after a pause: No. That presupposes that you are educated at the end of four years. Whereas actually you sometimes feel as if you are just beginning. Many times at the end of the sophomore year a student does not know what she is going to do. Sometimes that is good. But it is really neither good nor bad. Of course, it would be good *if* you could find out at the end of freshman year . . . it is a wonderful feeling to say all this that I think after four years!

From notes taken during an interview with the teacher who read with Priscilla in philosophy through her senior year, it is possible to outline, however sketchily, her attitude toward members of her family. Priscilla appeared to be able to see people as individuals, through and around them, without

destroying her spontaneous enjoyment of them. She had given considerable indication of devotion to her younger brother; yet she was able to characterize him as a "typical Southerner, temperamental and imaginative," with a long list of specific difficulties. Her mother seemed to her like a character out of Proust, a woman of brilliance, beauty, kindness, and intelligence, suffering from psychic and physical illness. She said quite simply that her mother was unhappy because life was not rich and fine and that it was not difficult to understand how her mother had become unable to accept the realities of her environment. A mixture of Northern Puritanism and indulgence during her childhood in a wealthy family, the conflict of certain cultural ideals of Northern and Southern society, the continuance of pressure by both clans on either side of the family—these things had much to do with personal disintegration. Priscilla seemed to accept a great many unhappy facts—suffering was one of them—she possessed a determination to live with forces making for life and to encourage life around her. She felt the pathos in people's lives but she also felt the humor. She referred to her fiancé, for example, as a young man who she suspected did not have the brains nor the interests she had, but to whom she was deeply attracted. She spoke calmly of marriage with its certain limitations; she nevertheless hoped for a family. She was fond of children, she said; she was also very fond of kittens!

Near the end of her college course a close friend had chatted casually with a faculty member about Priscilla's engagement; she had expressed concern over the fact that the young man, though attractive, had no intellectual ambitions. The faculty member asked this student if she implied that Priscilla was making a serious mistake in marrying instead of going ahead with a career. The student paused and then replied that she thought not, since it was Priscilla. If it were anyone else among the group of names she mentioned, she thought this might be said, but not of Priscilla. "You see," she added,

Priscilla knows us so much better than we know ourselves and she knows herself so much better than we know her, I suppose we've got to assume that she knows what she wants and that includes any Tom, Dick, etc., whom she may darn well decide to marry and maybe her children too. She won't need a don for them if she sends them to college. But it is strange after the swell range of people that she could have had. She goes over big you know; all the way from the dumb handsome to the Phi Beta type and the serious thinkers. But she'll be happy I guess; you know she says she likes to live and she knows what that means, charm included.

Just as Priscilla's fiancé had been a shock to a couple of her intellectual roommates, so an episode of her life following college shocked a group of her faculty. They were gradually forced to recognize that not the least extraordinary thing about Priscilla and the education she had somehow obtained from them was the capacity to accept compromises of a very serious kind without bluster or surprise and to proceed to make use of what opportunities such a compromise or disruption of plans forced upon her.

She had, as everybody knew, planned to continue study of anthropology at Columbia following her graduation, partly, as she said, because she wished to be in the North near her fiancé and partly because she wished to continue work in this field. The candid statement of the double motive was typical; there was no cause for surprise in this to those who knew Priscilla. But her friends on the faculty were rather appalled to discover during the autumn that a certain "Junior College" in the metropolitan area had written for Priscilla's college record. Why should this girl of all graduates be continuing any sort of work at a "finishing school"?

A letter to the Dean shortly followed, calmly stating the fact that her presence in the North still depended upon her family's consent and that they had been unwilling to have her away for the entire year because of various complications in family plans. Apparently her mother was willing to have her live, even for a short period of three months, only at the boarding-school which she herself had attended years

previously. Priscilla stated that in order to arrange this she supposed that the school had written for the routine records. Meanwhile she had discovered certain courses in art and income management at the Junior College level which she thought might keep her "from wasting time for the present" and though these were "conducted on a fairly juvenile scale, [they] were not bad," as the materials were new to her.

There is no intimation of the reasons for the serious prohibition of spending the full year in continuing graduate work. One does not know whether financial, or moral, or maternal sentiments determined the sacrifice. Nor is there in the letter a trace of bitterness or emotional distress; there is the acceptance of circumstance and the statement of a fact in the sentence, "If plans were not so disrupted and did not depend on my family's consent I would naturally have gone on with my love, Anthropology, at Columbia." Indeed both the acceptance of compromise and the use even in a small way of opportunities at hand recall the phrase used by her adviser in the middle of her third year in college: "She likes to build things into herself as she goes." One must assume in conclusion, that Priscilla's education will continue indefinitely with this "progressive" connotation.

Summary

Priscilla's case demonstrates a test of faculty devotion to disinterested criteria for development, that is, criteria relevant to the student rather than the faculty. Brilliant and capable in all her work, she never developed an interest of the do-or-die quality which would insist on its own fulfillment regardless of parental objections. The account of her work also includes the story of a successful though brief excursion into a field where she developed no lasting interest but which was important to her simply for reassurance that she could do good work in the area; the excursion served its purpose for her. Faculty and students alike were deeply impressed by the insight into herself, her problems and the

needs of other people which she distilled from her college work. Her growth was not so much in terms of permanent interest in an area of work as in terms of inward deepening and increased capacity to accept herself in relation to her world.

TEST RECORD FOR PRISCILLA

PRE-COLLEGE RECORD

Name of Test

Iowa Silent Reading Form B: Percentile, 80

Henmon-Nelson: IQ, 123

		<i>Percentile</i>
American Council on Education	1st trial	88
	2d trial	97

COLLEGE RECORD

American Council on Education

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
Completion	100	Analogies	75
Arithmetic	91	Opposites	87
Artificial Language	96	Gross Score	99

Bernreuter Personality Inventory

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
B1-N	45	B4-D	63
B2-S	29	F1-C	48
B3-1	57	F2-S	37

Allport-Vernon Values Study (scores from 31 to 28 are average)

	<i>Score</i>		<i>Score</i>
Theoretical	44	Social	23
Economics	25	Political	37
Aesthetic	28	Religious	23

Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Women

Nurse	B+	Lawyer	B+
Housewife	C	Physician	A
Social Worker	B	Librarian	B-
Secretary Stenographer	B	Author	A
Teacher in General	C	Artist	A

A SHY STUDENT: MARIAN

MARIAN came to this college an attractive girl who after the death of her mother had lived with relatives until her father's remarriage; she looked forward to a home of her own. She had no special talents or strong interest in any vocational field. In Form B, Marian's stepmother observes that Marian is exceptionally well balanced and normal; that she has never disobeyed and has never caused anxiety. She is considered unusually mature and well integrated. Nevertheless her stepmother feels it necessary to state that "any criticism or coldness" destroys the girl's self-confidence and that in these instances Marian "will express despair over ever doing anything worth while."

From Form A we learn that Marian seeks advice from her family about school and social relations and that she follows advice willingly. She says she makes her own decisions about clothes and friendships; is self-conscious among strangers but is easy to get along with. She tends, she says, to postpone decisions, hoping that events will make them unnecessary; yet she has held a fairly large number of class offices in her school, including that of president of her class. She has athletic and scout honors, and has enjoyed social activities in the school. She prefers to work, however, with one or two rather than a group; she has no trouble concentrating, but a good deal of difficulty "discriminating the important from the unimportant."

The first-year records emphasize certain points that are verified by these early reports. Marian has great difficulty with theory; she is content with facts and shows little ability to generalize. She is uneasy with vague or long assignments and always anticipates criticism about everything she does—in fact she often disparages everything she does. Her behavior shows that she is very much afraid of not doing the

right thing. She is very willing to work and shows increasing persistence with concrete, definite projects. Her perceptions are delicate and often acute, though her work shows no marked intelligence.

Her behavior through the year shows a consistent gain in confidence. She is at first tense and unsure of her capacity in art; "her muscular coördination is hampered by nervousness." In writing, she lacks initiative; in psychology she is timid, extremely dependent on directions from her teacher. She begins to show a sense of accomplishment and confidence in small, definite assignments. This gain increases first in art, in improvement in handling materials; then, slowly, in writing and in psychology. In the latter course, the student is told that she needs to develop a more "hard-boiled attitude in rejecting old and new preconceptions"—"to be more aggressive in her approach to ideas." By March her efforts to overcome this lack of aggressiveness are marked in writing and in psychology. The June reports note a real development of confidence, and a strong sense of design has emerged in the art work. Nevertheless, though Marian can assemble facts adequately for limited projects in psychology and has shown more initiative and improvement in writing, she is still unaware of implications; her questions are limited and she still wants to be told what to do, is "too shy and self-distrustful for her own good."

At the beginning of the second year, her behavior is again timid and dependent in American literature and in home-making. She shows anxiety about the fact that she is an "unclassified" student. But in art, where she had the year before gained most confidence, she begins where she left off; her increased confidence shows in her technical approach to the work; she begins by standing above the average of the group. The December reports mention her lack of confidence and aggressiveness, but after that she appears to improve greatly. She talks more critically about her reading and participates to some extent in the literature class; her independent work

in homemaking is well organized and presented. She shifts from project work in literature to work in writing.

In this work her behavior in class lacks any decisiveness, but that in conference gains in this respect. Her writing is sentimental and lacking in the ability to state things as they are. When, later, she tries "straight realism" the result is bad: "in her effort to be realistic and satirical she became angry and vulgar and didn't know how to solve her problem"; but the main idea of one story was original—in fact it was later used in the design for a cover for one of the more sophisticated magazines. This originality was increasingly apparent in her work in ceramics and textiles also, particularly in color and form rather than in mechanical construction or technique. She was capable, however, of carrying out her ideas with increasing skill while receiving help with the mechanical steps. On the whole, her record for the second year shows capacity to plan schedules of work for herself in college and to order her social life to better advantage. The first year exhibited continual dependence upon social life outside the campus; during the second year she makes full use of her social privileges but there is not quite so steady a succession of dates. There is no doubt, however, that she is popular with the opposite sex and with her friends on campus.

Attitudes

Marian's attitudes are comparatively consistent at college; they do not exhibit marked ambivalence except in making decisions. In contrast to the reports of her maturity and leadership in secondary school, she is timid, shy, remarkably afraid to venture intellectual opinions of any kind other than those she has been taught or that she holds "by conviction." Her reports during the first year tell us little more than this: she is very emotional about "family" and "love" (love comes with a bang and lasts forever). She has a consistent "sentimental tenderness" for poor or unhappy or injured creatures—people, or puppies, or whatever. She is very anxious to do

something in the art work to gain the attention of some of her relatives. As a protection against failure (which she admits) she always tends "to expect the worst." Decisions are very different (though we are not told what kind) and even after a decision she tends to feel the alternative would have been better perhaps, or just as good as the way she decided.

Her own comments (on Form A) somewhat amplify this picture. She considers herself about average in her class. She feels she does her best work when she knows that her teacher has confidence in her. She enjoys family entertainments most and does not enjoy large dances where she knows few people. She thinks she generally lets others talk and entertain among older people, but finds herself the center of a group among her own age. She feels uncomfortable with sophisticated boys but enjoys boys who are simple, friendly, polite, and whom she has known for a long time. She considers that her feelings are easily hurt; but she is easy to get along with. She is not, she thinks, easy to understand—at least she has been told so by a teacher who said she was "too reserved." She does not often indulge in daydreaming; and does not tend to plan for the future; she does not find herself superior in her associates intellectually. She worries about "work," "forgetfulness," and "intellectual inferiority."

It is interesting to note that the records do not present instances of strong positive or negative attitudes. There are apparently no "crushes" on teachers and no "antipathies." The attitude toward her teachers seems to be a consistent one of respect for authority and a strong sense of dependence upon their directions and an eagerness to do "the right thing." There is no evidence of conscious courting of favor or doing work in one way or another to please them; her literature teacher says, "She is not a spineless little thing—she has sharp standards and values and will not be moved as quickly by the desire for approval of other students or her teacher as her obvious envy of them (because everybody is smarter than she is) might make you expect." This is verified by her dignity

of bearing when other students sharply criticize her aunt's writing.

Both the don's running record the first year and the samples of Marian's autobiographical writing show that the girl adores and idealizes the stepmother with whom she now lives; this lady came as a fairy godmother and has retained some of the initial glamor. Marian loves her brother and older sister but does not seem dependent on them. The strongest antagonism exhibited anywhere in the record is toward her paternal grandmother, with whom she lived as a young child for a year or so; the hostility evidenced here is very strong. There is no direct expression of her attitude toward her father, but a close friend is astonished that she is so objective about him and her psychology teacher thinks she is less objective than appears on the surface. There is no evidence of memory of her mother.

She does not seem to be interested in people of importance: the literary circle entertained constantly in her aunt's home means to her "only more dishes to wash." Yet her attitude toward her family is one almost of awe. They are still, including her cousins, enormously smart. She "is surrounded by geniuses."

Interests

Marian's Form A indicates that her favorite subjects of study have been drawing, English, and dramatics; she disliked languages because they were always difficult for her, as were mathematics and chemistry. The same form shows a strong interest in sports and in social events of an informal nature. Her autobiographical material evidences a love of open ranch life and both this and the Form A show some trace of an interest in travel, but this is not striking.

Her prospective program is sketched to include an art course (sculpture), an introduction to literature, some language (probably beginning German?), and dramatics activity.

Her program the first year turns out to be: introduction to psychology; ceramics and textiles; special writing.

Her choices for the second year were: ceramics and textiles; American literature; homemaking; writing (begun in January).

The reports and the record for the first year show only three points of strong interest. These were in biology connected with psychology, in the design of pottery and textiles, and in writing. The continuance of effort in writing would indicate a strong steady interest there; but no one kind of writing makes an especial appeal and, though determination is shown to learn, there is considerable lack of initiative and aggressiveness. In biology there is no apparent capacity to grasp theoretical implications but the reports speak of this student's pleasure in accomplishment of descriptive anatomical tasks set in the laboratory. This is perhaps the reason that she did not choose to continue this subject.

All the reports indicate that Marian is more interested in concrete, factual material than in the general or theoretical. She felt the duty of a critical project in American literature "a heavy one." Her instructor concluded that because her critical capacity was so negligible and because she had said she would like to write, she could profitably undertake another project with some other teacher as a substitute for the original assignment. Marian did so and because the work was outside her regular program it freed her from the fear that the writing might not measure up to academic standards of credit. The teacher reported that Marian had great difficulty in observing accurately and in stating what she had seen or experienced. She wrote and seemed to choose to write along the lines of some vague, preconceived pattern of sentimental, storybook stuff. She seemed to follow a standard set "by the old St. Nicholas, The Birds' Christmas Carol style—always slightly off key emotionally, sometimes genuinely sweet and genuinely sensitive if it could be made to penetrate below the surface of its 'lies.'"

The reports for the second year reveal little interest in reading, and although there is a gain in critical sense, at the end of the year there is still either an inability or an inhibition to state what she feels or thinks about what she reads. This is evident in the writing class also. The interest in the homemaking course has grown enormously during the year, particularly in the practical cooking activity of the course. In art her interest develops more definitely than in any other area. She is strongly attracted to problems in design, shows originality and a growing sense of discrimination in form and color. She is markedly less interested in the technical processes of working out her ideas; she is somewhat slow to analyze the mechanical processes, but she makes progress here and seems greatly to enjoy the actual work on the wheel.

Marian states in Form A that what she wants from college is to become "a cultured woman, familiar with what is best in music, letters, art; and at ease in society." During her first year in college she writes a very brief statement (in psychology) on what she "wants out of life." Here the ideal is slightly enlarged: she wants first, after leaving college, financial independence—a job; but most of all she wants a family, children; she wants to be a good wife and mother, loved and respected by her children, socially at ease. She adds that she thinks she can achieve the first part of her hope but "a good hostess, wife and mother . . . I'm not sure I can be all that."

In view of these ends, her prospective choice for study her last year in college are interesting: sculpture, the family, literature, and writing. Except for the interest in dramatics stated in Form A and never followed up, and the sporadic interest in laboratory work in freshman biology, this choice of courses seems exactly to fit the picture of interests revealed by her record.

The sources of Marian's shyness or sense of inadequacy may be guessed from her story of shifting homes and the disciplinary attitude of the grandmother who cared for her

after her mother's death, that is, in the lack of warm, secure affection at an early age. They may also lie in the fact that she is the less able and bright of a brilliant family with whom competition must have been a considerable strain or a source of confusion. Her interest in art appears to arise from natural talents, which are otherwise exhibited only in her relationships with people—this appears to be satisfying and successful. Both her interest in writing and her family ideal—"the cultured woman, good wife and mother," and so on—appear to have their roots naturally enough in the person and the family of the "fairy godmother" who cared for her from the age of ten.

There is no doubt she would do well in arts and that she would gain from writing, possibly from journalism. On the basis of her interests in family life and children, further work in study of the family, child psychology and nursery school may be of great value. The motivation is there: "She said her job at home was to take care of young cousins, but even in doing this she wanted to work with more intelligence, wanted to take advantage of what Sarah Lawrence had to offer her—that she dreaded leaving college feeling half-educated."

At the end of two years at this college a number of questions were raised.

1. There is little doubt that the college has already opened areas to this student in which she can gain confidence and will not have to meet the competitive pressure with the most brilliant members of her family. Art, possibly dramatics, and study of family are all fields which may lead to productive, useful, and satisfying living. But should the college encourage this student of very limited ability to continue into the fourth year toward an A.B.? Does her progress in these areas indicate the possibility of such a degree? Would not the failure to achieve such a degree awaken again the sense of inadequacy and destroy the confidence now genuinely based on achievement? This is the dilemma.

2. Should writing be continued? Even in view of the suggestion made by her instructor, are this student's talents and intelligence sufficient to lead to any achievement in writing outside college? If not, is it constructive or destructive to encourage her to follow in the footsteps of the professional aunt whom she idealized? It must be remembered that the ideal of the aunt holds other tangents of activity for Marian; the feminine role of cultured and modified-conventional pattern. Will failure in writing at a later time tend to destroy the hope of following this feminine ideal in its other valuable aspects? Could not an attempt be made now to divert the interest of the student into fields other than writing? Would not the wisest advice be, as her literary teacher suggests, to encourage Marian "to think less romantically of a literary career"?

Hence, should not dramatics be tried as a possible opening along with the family study and the sculpture?

3. But if writing is continued, will it be possible to release the latent hostility in this girl's character? It has appeared only in two instances: the autobiographic record of the grandmother, written during the first year; and a sketch, described by her writing instructor, written during the second year. In the sketch the hostility was not fully released and it was not controlled artistically: she "attempted to satirize a group of girls sunbathing on a Sarah Lawrence roof. Her emotions about them were mixed: she identified herself with them and hated them at the same time"; "she became angry and vulgar and didn't know how to solve the problem." If this hypothesis is measurably correct, it would be of inestimable value to this student to be able to "solve the problem" artistically. Even though the chances of being a writer are slight it may still be worth while to continue work in writing for the therapeutic value of a moderate control of art forms along these lines of feeling.

4. As a minor question: Based on the record of her work in ceramics and textiles is it not highly questionable that this

student will derive a sense of success from sculpture? Does she not need the support of the quasi-mechanical processes for achievement? Is not sculpture too free, wide, uncharted an area in which to find direction—for her?

As against this speculative question, it might be argued that Marian has shown least interest in the mechanics or the technical aspects of the work in ceramics and textiles: she is good at design and slow in working out the methods of achieving her ideas in the concrete material.

As Marian completed her degree at an excellent Western university, we could not follow her last two years in detail. After graduation she married and now appears to be an extremely well-integrated and competent citizen and home-maker.

Summary

Marian's story in college is one of intellectual insecurity, coupled with a marked consistency about her own values. She was and is thoroughly feminine; she was at first thought to be too feminine to do good work in courses with an intellectual rather than practical emphasis, but showed improvement during the latter part of her time here. Subsequently, she completed her A.B. at a university of the highest standing near her home. The sketch has been included because it illustrates certain problems referred to in the discussion of the feminine role: it is not only this generation of women students who find themselves bewildered by the feeling that domestic values are considered sentimental and unworthy of an intelligent college student.

TEST RECORD FOR MARIAN

PRE-COLLEGE RECORD

Name of Test

Otis SAB: IQ, 105

Terman Group A: IQ, 108

Ohio State Psychological: Percentile, 75

COLLEGE RECORD

American Council on Education

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
Completion	23	Analogies	84
Arithmetic	12	Opposites	49
Artificial Language	26	Total	33

Bernreuter Personality Inventory

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
B1-N	37	B4-D	13
B2-S	31	F1-C	65
B3-1	18	F2-S	9

SUCCESS WITHOUT GROWTH:

MADELEINE, JULIA, AND JUDITH

THE THREE STUDENTS whose college careers are summarized in this chapter are related in that each of them, unlike Patsy and Anne (see pp. 356 ff.), achieved good results in their college work. Their difficulties appeared in the lack of personal growth; in all three cases their work seems to have served defensive needs and never to have become the springboard from which a leap into a broader experience and a deeper integration of feeling with understanding could be achieved. It may fairly be said that we never learned to educate girls like these in the terms in which we have been discussing education.

ACHIEVEMENT VERSUS DEVELOPMENT:

MADELEINE

Madeleine is a girl of enormous ambition and very uneven abilities. According to the American Council Test her intellectual abilities are only comparable to those of students in the bottom quartile of college students throughout the country. That this did not fully represent her ability will be apparent from the story that follows. As we read of her difficulties in responding to areas of college work other than a few narrowly defined fields, it is important to remember that she doubtless had very limited ability in many intellectual functions.

The story of Madeleine is interesting mainly because it illustrates the success and failure in this student's education, depending upon the terms of our criteria. If one asks, "Did Madeleine enlarge and deepen her experience? Has she become a wiser and more mature person? Does she understand herself and what she is after?", the answers would have to

be negative. And this is particularly ironical when one compares her record with a student such as Rachel. In the latter's case there is no great ambition, there is no persistent mastering of skills, there is scarcely enough enthusiasm about college work to lead to a clear formulation of a program for senior year. Yet Rachel has felt more deeply and broadly. She is both wise and mature now, wiser and more mature, perhaps, than Madeleine will ever be. She sees herself clearly and knows what she is after; she accepts herself and the world about her. College is only moderately important to her; but just important enough to finish because of what she does; she fits its values into her scheme of life without worrying and without a great deal of effort.

But Madeleine has a much better academic record than Rachel. She has a first-rate record in language, finishing senior year at college with fairly polished translations of Spanish plays. She has acted four or five principal roles in the theatre and has taken responsibility for organizing productions; she has put on and directed and occasionally written plays. She has mastered a technique of voice with very little voice to begin with, and she has done required theoretical work in music with satisfaction to her instructors. Her work in economics was average; in drama very good indeed. There was no question concerning credit for the degree; her standing in the groups she worked with was better than average and in spots outstanding. But before we attempt an evaluation of this college course we must turn to the record itself.

Madeleine has not had an easy time. Her general background contributes markedly to her early adjustment problems at college. She came with mixed ideas, very confused by the acute disruption in her sense of security. From the position of social leadership in a Middle Western home town, she comes to a group where her clothes, manners, speech, interests, and taste set her apart from more sophisticated city girls. She is uncertain of herself, afraid that she will not be accepted by them, and is somewhat aggressive

in her timidity. She speaks very little of her parents or of their interests. They entered into the picture only when she spoke of reasons for coming to Sarah Lawrence. She indicates that they regret her dependence on them and feel it would be a good experience for her to be on her own feet. Her parents' choice of Sarah Lawrence seems to have been dominated largely by a desire to find a school in the East which will provide contacts with Eastern cultural opportunities and add to proper social status. There seems to be little awareness of the distinctive educational approach of this college, save that here it would be "easier" to do as you wish and include considerable extracurricular activity.

Some years earlier Madeleine had decided that she wanted to teach languages, probably French and Spanish. The conventional school she attended had offered no languages other than Latin, which she enjoyed, but its dramatic program had great importance to her. The role she played in the final production won considerable social approval which she seemed especially to need. She had some difficulty in deciding whether to teach or to be an actress. On coming to Sarah Lawrence the theatre was uppermost in her mind. She had seen very few plays in the theatre. Her determination for the theatre seemed to rest very largely on family praise.

The first week she came to conference tense, high-strung, and very talkative; obviously uncertain of herself. She knew exactly what she wanted to take: French, Spanish, dramatics, and literature. She had little conception of what other fields might mean to her and no eagerness to talk to various members of the faculty to find out. Her intellectual interests were very definitely limited.

French and Spanish were means to a specific end. Dramatics represented the continuation of a successful experience. Learning was apparently not fun or interesting in itself. She was extremely wary of the untried. Every suggestion presented a conflict. Literature "might be good for me," but she hesitated because she would find it hard and because

"I get nervous easily. . . . I'm not a writer." Although she seemed eager to do more reading, she emphasized the fact that she was "not a reader." This she explained by saying that she was an outdoor girl and liked sports, repeating frequently that reading made her nervous, that she got bored easily, that she could not keep her attention focused. It was obvious that her anticipation in relation to life at college lay in the social sphere and in her contacts with the East rather than in academic work.

A program as finally arranged included French, dramatics, and English. From the outset Madeleine felt harassed and uncertain and timid in the English course. A change in section, because of the large number registered for the course, did little to resolve her difficulties. She suggested dropping English entirely but there was nothing that she wished to substitute. Science was closed to her. She had no interest or curiosity about music or the arts. She did have a certain feeble interest in the possibility of taking psychology. But she was terrified lest working in this field would make her nervous and think she "had all the diseases." She talked frequently of a very wonderful "psychology book" which her sister had used at school and which "gave the answers to everything." The choice of psychology seemed particularly wise for her, largely because she did have this desire to find out more about herself and the way human beings think and react, and also because of her obvious problems in this area. Hesitantly she accepted the suggestion that she see one of the psychology teachers and, on discussing the content of the course decided to substitute this work for her English.

She talked at great length of her difficulties in meeting people, saying that she felt so afraid people wouldn't like her that she was unable to be herself. A good deal of time was spent talking about the new approach which college demanded. It seemed necessary to dramatize the need for independence, the setting of her own job, since without closely directed individual work she felt lost and helpless. She would

bring in a psychology book tearfully saying that she simply couldn't read it; that it was impossible to concentrate; that she was a slow reader and couldn't understand what it was all about. A good portion of early conference time was spent in reviewing reading, in outlining questions, and in suggesting methods of approach.

Her homesickness continued throughout October and November. She regarded the brief Thanksgiving vacation, for which she could not go home, as unbearable. She talked of going home once and for all. By this time she felt somewhat more assured in her work but utterly isolated in her social relations. It was possible through the coöperation of another student who remained on campus over Thanksgiving to see that Madeleine had some companionship. The friendliness of her fellow student turned the few days into a fairly pleasurable experience.

In the few weeks before Christmas vacation Madeleine could talk of little else but going home. She was confident that once she returned home she would not come back to college. We decided that the thing for her to do while at home was to try to draw up an alternate program to see how she could best spend her time were she to stay at home and compare it with what she could do at her college. She had no specific plans for the vacation; nothing more definite than the mere fact of being at home. Her motivation was dominated apparently by a desire to escape from a difficult situation. We felt certain that she would be back in January.

She did return, however. The first week she was more miserable than ever, although she realized that nothing she could do at home would be preferable to college. She agreed that it would be a good idea to look at college freshly and to try to find other things to make her experience "more fun." By the second week she decided that she was delighted to be back. She now realized that she knew how to go about her work and that she had ideas as to what she might do. Her earlier tenseness began slowly to disappear. She began to

realize that she was making friends and was actually well liked.

By February she was bubbling, happy, and talkative. The range of subjects introduced into conference by her was much enlarged. She began to be very much concerned with current events. Previously anything removed from her own personal experience had been too remote to concern her. Now she was eager to discuss her reading in psychology and to raise questions. She spent a good deal of time saying how silly it was to have been so miserable, and she wanted to analyze the problem. For the first time she was eager to have the comments of her faculty on her work. She continued to spend most of her week ends on campus, but took occasional trips to New York for the theatre, and now began to consider the possibility of visits to museums and galleries. Instead of being confused by diverse viewpoints, she was curious to see how they might be reconciled. Her attitude toward boys seemed a little foolish to her; she thought she might like to meet some but was a little puzzled as to how to go about it. She began to suggest possibilities for a program for next year. She was eager to explore in literature and sample the social sciences. The previously closed books of music and art were slowly beginning to open.

From March continuously through June, Madeleine continued to find new interests, new enthusiasms. She had time for everything. The quality of her work improved markedly and she was excited about every aspect of her study. She had lost the feeling of shyness and hesitancy in the group, was never at a loss to find material for projects, and showed considerable initiative in planning them.

She continued to absorb as much of what New York had to offer as time allowed. By the end of the year she felt so completely happy at college that she would gladly have stayed on rather than to have returned home. In fact she began telling her psychology teacher that she would "never, never return home to live." She would go on the stage in New

York. "She wished never to marry." She regarded living at home as imprisonment. The theatre would free her from both home and marriage.

At the beginning of the second year it looked as though Madeleine's difficulties in adjusting to college were over. Her interests in language and dramatics (theatre) remained; she chose a program of French and dramatics, added Spanish and was willing to explore the area of social science through introductory economics. Her early reports were good in all these subjects, but as the year went on increasing signs of unrest and moodiness reappeared.

She was overconscientious in most of her work; was greatly preoccupied with detail, but at the same time needed to be given a pattern into which to fit detail. She seemed unable to get the pattern of a whole play or book herself from the raw material; but once having acquired it, worked happily with concrete material. She tended to use the teacher of Spanish as a confidant, giving him clear evidence of alternate moods of enthusiasm and depression. There were times when she hated college, hated the people in it, felt herself incapable of good work or of ever achieving her ambition. On the whole, she was docile in the face of direction or demands, but occasionally protested in a tone of quite intense hostility. For example, in Spanish she insisted upon a fairly old-fashioned method of learning; she demanded grammar, and grammar first, and seemed eager to master every fraction of an inch of it.

In the theatre her temperamental troubles showed up most strikingly. She became extravagantly ambitious, telling the director she hoped by the time she finished college to begin on Broadway where "Helen Hayes is now," and to go way beyond this. She exhibited constantly the need for finding out what the instructors thought of her and her work. She asked continually for comment and criticism. A great deal of the time criticism sent her into moods of extreme depression.

She wanted the "right answer" to everything—this was as

true of questions in economics as of the technique of acting. She assumed that there is a right answer to every question and that the right teacher, if bright enough, could give it to her. She was inclined to appreciate economics for its "usefulness" while at the same time paying little attention to its personal applications to her own life. She was definitely taking dramatics as a means to a career; she claimed that her chief interest was music, but explained that she was not ready to work in that field because it was not at the moment useful to her. The choice of careers seemed to accord somewhat with her alternating moods of depression and vaulting ambition. She was avid of success in everything—"a perfectionist if there ever was one"—but as she neared success she grew frightened, signs of anxiety appeared and quite often she had difficulty concentrating. She was avid of praise, but when she got it, "deprecatd it."

The appearance of these traits during the second year suggested a careful study of her behavior and all the information about her up to that time. This was done at the end of the year. In spite of fairly good reports in all the subjects carried, it was clear that something must be done to try to lessen the anxiety under which the student was working much of the time; for to continue into the advanced two years with this burden raised grave questions of the possibility of a breakdown or difficulties with final criteria for the degree. Moreover, it appeared from the choice of advanced work that the student's program was becoming increasingly narrow, not in range of subject but in the limitation of kinds of learning. It was obvious that she was interested only in acquired skills. Her work in economics had been done well enough and she had at times shown interest, but she did not wish to go ahead with work in this field. She did, however, wish to pursue language and dramatics. It was only after considerable discussion that she was willing at last to try work in music, which she had often said was an absorbing interest to her.

As a problem in guidance the girl's record was interesting.

Not only were the sources of anxiety comparatively hidden, but the intense preoccupation with acquiring skills and the disinclination to "broaden out"—to try various types of study for the experience they might give—was discouraging in view of the college's aim. It was clear that the personality was extremely rigid and that the two experiences off the line of her main interests in skills—psychology and economics—had resulted in little more than a perfunctory meeting of academic demands, a willing, facile lip service with no depths of interest and no real comprehension of the major issues involved in those fields. The recommendations following the analysis of her records were, thus, along the line of accepting her tenacious interest in skills, her vocational aspirations, and attempting to deepen her feeling and perception within these areas. For example, the report lists two types of needs: Academic Needs:

1. Training in line with vocational aspirations—language, theatre;
2. Training in sustained analysis, development of capacity to see problems from their larger implications; for example, the whole of a dramatic role;
3. The development of critical imagination, or the perception of analogies between less obviously associated ideas or areas.
4. Possibly, the extension of language study into cultural implications.

Emotional Needs:

1. Constant approval and recognition to build self-confidence;
2. Confidence in social areas especially in relation to opposite sex;
3. "Safe areas" of study where mastery of skill is the emphasis. Note: It would seem advisable for her to continue the two skills in which she has by now some assurance of technique—i.e., theatre and French and Spanish; but also to add the experiment of work in an "unsafe" or untried area, particularly another one of the arts where she could be encouraged toward fuller emotional expression. The pressure toward independent work might be increased in the "safe areas," but this should be done gradually, and with plenty of direction in other tasks at the same time. In the new or untried area

she should be given careful direction and not forced to do independent work unless she seeks it. Every opportunity for extending her emotional range of perception should be taken.

The report concludes with a somewhat pessimistic picture of educational possibilities for this student. It argues against the expectation that campus and college experience will greatly change the rigid set of her character. It suggests that she will still postulate ambitions far beyond the limits of her environment or her capacity; suffer defeats and alternating moods; be unable to make very deep friendships, and probably fail to achieve a happy, adult relationship with the opposite sex. Hence it argues that the theatre might be as constructive a vocational aim for her as the teaching of language, for the theatre offers a greater sense of power and the pleasure of continual recognition; also, it represents an escape from the respectable family environment in which her conflicts are rooted. Further, the report urges a carefully recorded follow-up of this student during the coming year and a further study of her case at the end of junior year.

Advanced Work

The story of Madeleine from this point on can be given very briefly. She continued Spanish and dramatics for the next two years. She tried the experiment of the study of singing in the third year and continued this on a somewhat reduced time basis the last year. In the last year she added a thorough course in dramatic literature, which came nearer, perhaps, than any of the rest of her work in college to being a real experience of critical learning. In this course, work was much more than perfunctory; and she developed considerable independent judgment.

Right through the third year the reports praise her work. They contain, however, indications of emotional difficulties; for example, in Spanish she tends to overwork, seeking the most difficult dialect for translation and forcing herself into the study of intricate grammatical constructions and idiom.

This tends to disappear when she persuades the teacher to let her work on translations of certain plays for publication. In dramatics there is a history of depression and anxiety and of a growing avarice for leading roles. The reports from voice study, which are very encouraging so far as mastery of techniques go, actually refer to "violent emotional swings" that made "patient, concentrated work" difficult for her; she tended "to tie herself up in knots" when she approached her songs analytically; she could not seem to let herself be guided by musical feeling, which was very good indeed. It was as if every utterance must be rationally controlled by conscious technique. Precisely this difficulty stood in the way of her achievements in acting.

A further study of the records of her work and behavior at the beginning of her senior year contributed a great deal to the understanding of the girl. It was pointed out that the emotional swings and moods, which had perceptibly diminished since the second year, now appeared most sharply in dramatics and voice study. It was discovered that the teacher of each of these courses had been trying to get her to "let go"—to follow her inner sense of song or of a dramatic role more freely. She herself was conscious of the need for relaxation, but could not achieve it. A change in methods was urged. The teachers stopped directly accentuating relaxation and "letting go"; they praised her technical gains and the result was real improvement. She actually did "let go" in a couple of dramatic roles that apparently gave her the necessary sense of security in technique. The report from voice study for June referred to the successful period between Christmas and Easter when all she had studied in music and the techniques related to it found their place in her singing. Evidently a comparative integration of feeling and thought had begun to occur.

The chief contribution of the second analysis of all material relating to this student, however, was to present quite clearly what was giving all the trouble and to infer at least generally

what had brought it about. It was demonstrated that Madeleine had repressed (probably since early childhood) every spontaneous emotional impulse; that she had built up a personality based upon "unremitting rational control" of her reactions to all situations.

It became fairly certain that the child had been trained to regard external behavior and the opinions of people about her as of very first importance and had been disciplined in various ways into the repression of spontaneity. The denial of spontaneity had left her without a real basis for belief or confidence in herself, hence the continued need for relying upon what people said about her, upon techniques in learning, upon constant alertness and tension. It was as if she could not relax for a moment—not even in the privacy of her own room—for she was only what she had made herself in these ways. Criticism of any of her work thus became really a threat to her ego. She was not suffering from a loss of affection, friendships, or love, in any immediate sense; people were meaningful to her only in so far as they could present her with the correct external values, those which would give her security in any environment and lead to recognition as somebody in that environment.

As the report points out, the sameness of the picture of this student contributed by very different teachers is almost appalling. The questions raised as to what the college had done for her were also very embarrassing. There appeared no real evidence that any fundamental change or "liberation" had occurred; was it therefore true that she was no better prepared for adequate living in the world outside? It was even asked whether it had been wise for anyone so dependent on external values ever to have abandoned the relative coherence and security of her earlier environment. But the answers were not entirely in the negative. It was obvious that the student was better informed. She had learned a great many facts indeed; she had picked up a great many comparatively superficial patterns of taste and behavior. These, while

they definitely had unfitted her for return to her home town, had nevertheless built up or elaborated the rational defenses she had begun as a child. It was argued that she had at least learned in the friendly atmosphere of college to take a good deal of criticism. One of the most encouraging facts was that she had worked in a summer theatre between her junior and senior years and had held her job successfully in spite of the fact that the boss did not really like her personality or approve of her. Yet after a performance of a play by her group on the Yale campus she had become desperately upset over the criticism of her acting in a Yale paper.

The long and short of the faculty discussion was that her prospects in a theatrical career were at the best uncertain. Though the theatre might be expected to be just the medium for her, in that it gave her vicariously the emotional life she had put aside for herself—gave her a chance to express others' emotions, not her own—nevertheless, her own inability to trust herself prevented her achieving a level of artistic expression commensurate with her ambitions. Indeed, it had been observed that tragic parts were next to impossible for her to carry. It seemed therefore imperative, so far as guidance was concerned, to attempt to help this girl build up a secondary and further defense by way of an alternative to acting as a career. Even more than this, it was important to bring her to a realization that her life did not hang upon this career alone and that there might come a time when she would want to do something else, or to live differently. As an illustration of the attempt to bring this home to her and of the difficulties involved, the following dictated record of one conference in the autumn of the senior year is pertinent.

Madeleine stopped in at 2 o'clock this afternoon, asking if she could see me. She had not appeared at regular conference time at 8:45 this morning. Last week she did not turn up at 8:45 and when I ran into her later in the morning and asked her if she was coming in to see me that day she said she might come in at 2:30 but she didn't do so. Since the skipping of these two conferences followed my request the week before that she bring me a state-

ment about what she wanted to get out of conferences the rest of the year, I thought the evasions were part of a general pattern of not wanting to confront issues directly.

This afternoon she made no reference to that question, nor did I. When I asked her how things were going she first talked about her sinus which is troubling her, the fact that it bothers her greatly in cold weather, and that she is planning to get down to a doctor in Bronxville for help on it.

She seemed direct and intense in her reactions and during the following discussion chewed her finger nails most of the time and frequently talked quite dramatically, at times almost violently. She said dramatics was going very badly, that it gave her no satisfaction at all, that it was always this way—she had to put so much into it; would go into rehearsal for a play feeling absolutely limp and would be exhausted after plays. I think it was at this point that I raised the question of work next year, asking whether it was wise to depend so much on going on the stage if she got so little satisfaction out of it. She was quite dramatic as she said it had always been an intense desire, that she could remember telling her mother at the age of four that she would be a great actress some day and that even though other possibilities might be more practical she could not get away from the intense urge to be an actress.

I think I asked her what kinds of things did give her the sense of satisfaction she craved and she said, "Music." She listens to music for hours, plays the piano and sings, but she had no training since the age of eight in anything except voice. A song that she throws herself into leaves her feeling satisfied and content. Playing the piano and working out a hard score gives her a strong sense of achievement but leaves her exhausted. She likes Tschaikowsky best. At one point she said he was the only person she liked. When I said, "How about Wagner, how about Sibelius?" she was quite dramatic and said, "Oh yes, Sibelius is second." She has never heard anything of Tschaikowsky that she did not enjoy intensely. There has always been a great conflict between music and dramatics. She has felt this all through college. When I suggested that perhaps there might not be a variety of jobs in music, she insisted that there were—for instance, teaching, accompanying, etc., but it would take years to get ready for work in music. In order to be an accompanist one would have to read the most difficult things at sight and be able to transpose in any key, and she might go through all this study and still find herself without a job. I asked her whether the sense of satisfaction in music

was due to the fact that she felt freer than in dramatics. She said that she could give herself to a song, a melody, more easily than to a play, that frequently she did not think about the words she was singing, in fact frequently she could not stand them. Humorous songs were all right and words in a foreign language (because that made it easier not to think of the meaning), but she could not stand songs of love and death in English or in any words that she was actually thinking about.

When I asked her about teaching dramatics she said, "I haven't the patience. I could direct a play but I haven't the patience to teach people the things they need to know. I could give them my ideas but I could not bring them to the point where they could use their own."

She was very intense about wanting to have a plan, something that would give her a sense of progress. She felt that dramatics was abstract, that you would never know where you were, and that it would be hard to feel progress, whereas in music you would always know you were progressing.

She did not want to consider the variety of possibilities. She wanted to plan on one thing that she could go ahead in and stick to permanently.

As is characteristic of her conversation, she is apt to jump around, pursuing one point intensely for a few minutes, then hopping back or away to some other point. At about this time in the discussion she went into a sort of oration or lecture to herself, which she has done before, sounding like a parent or teacher giving advice to the young. "If I could only concentrate. If I could only focus on what I am doing, give myself real preparation before coming to rehearsal instead of going unprepared and expecting divine inspiration to carry me through."

I came back to the point of why it was hard for her to use dramatic and musical material on themes of love and death, and asked her if she had had any experiences with death as a child. She said that when she was 13 her little dog had died and that that was the first thing she had ever lost that she cared deeply about. She did not remember attitudes of her family toward death or any experiences connected with people, neither did she volunteer fears of her own death.

About love she said, "I threw love out of the window a long time ago. The idea of sex is completely repulsive to me." She became humorous then and said, "Of course I go around with a group of strait-laced girls at home and I am the worst of them, but I don't feel that I am missing anything. I get along all right." When

I said, "Oh yes, I know that feeling very well, but when Tschaikowsky comes along some day you will feel very differently," she laughed with amusement and said, "Yes, I very probably will." Occasionally references to a possible future Tschaikowsky were made later. She accepted the idea completely with the general pattern that Tschaikowsky would doubtless be poor and it would still be a good idea to be able to earn part of the living herself.

In just what context I have forgotten, the question was raised of how important financial security was. She was quite violent about this. "My conscience would not let me go back and be dependent on my family after they have given me an education. Of course they would not throw me out. They would let me stay home and be dependent on them and grow into a weakling, but I could not stand doing that. I want to stand on my own feet and be independent."

The conference lasted about an hour, ending when she said, "I have a class and I must go now." There is a curious quality about her, of great intensity being spit up, as it were, a certain quality of frankness, even intimacy, but without any real overtones, rapport, or shared feelings.

I get a vivid sense of changes of mood, of the completely contradictory evaluations of dramatics that she has at one time and another, of the fact that quite possibly her only real emotional freedom comes in music, that in spite of her willingness to talk about herself there seems to be little real insight, a constant tendency to confront problems by reminding herself of sermonlike principles and rules that serve as a guide to the next step of behavior. I have a feeling that almost any plan regarding the future might be gotten across if conveyed in a framework of sufficient moral prestige; and that although she obviously does have strong emotional drive toward "big parts" and being a "great actress," it is important for her to have some acceptable patterns to fall back on when and if these ambitions prove unfeasible.

That this attempt to suggest another possible (possible in the sense of respectably satisfying to Madeleine) pattern of life was at least partially successful cannot be demonstrated. But there are three facts which are powerful by inference. The "drive for leading roles" appeared to become less insistent during the senior year and after such conferences were taking place. The student's interest appeared quite genuine in a major undertaking of organizing and directing a group

of plays put on by the employees of the college. There was clear evidence of skill, tact, and good humor in working with these people and there was no assistance given her from the dramatics staff. Thirdly, there is evidence that the young Tchaikowsky did actually turn up in the form of a young and gifted pianist and that the announcement of an engagement was planned.

The following report by her Spanish teacher seems important to include as evidence of the unique achievement which the efforts of Madeleine and her teachers accomplished.

As an illustration of her achievements during the last two years, one may point to her translations and analyses of three of the most complex dramas by Florencio Sanchez, the foremost Latin American playwright of the beginning of this century: "Los Muertos" (The Dead), "Los Derechos de la Salud" (The Rights of Health), and "Nuestros Hijos" (Our Children). As far as I know, this is the first time that a student at an American college has successfully brought to completion such an undertaking. Psychologically as well as linguistically, Sanchez is one of the most "difficult" Latin American playwrights to translate. I am glad to be able to state that in her translations this student has recaptured not only the emotional texture, but also the idiomatic flavor of Sanchez' works. This I consider a unique achievement.

There is no evidence of any subsequent use of the competence in Spanish reflected here.

After this point, a tragedy occurred in the family which came so suddenly and unexpectedly that it created considerable change in Madeleine's feeling about returning home. Eventually she left home with her mother and began to work in a well-known playhouse; the expected engagement did not come off.

Summary

Madeleine is an extreme example of the student to whom college work, growth, development have meaning only in terms of achievement, and achievement is necessary for its

assurance of status. Like most such girls she did not recognize her insecurity clearly, because she thought of her family and their status as superior; yet she was so dependent upon this real or supposed status that she was extremely insecure without it. Another aspect of her character was the emotional intensity which could not, at this stage of her development, be integrated into her everyday experiences and behavior but which came through only in her work in dramatics.

TEST RECORD FOR MADELEINE

PRE-COLLEGE RECORD

(No information)

COLLEGE RECORD

Name of Test

American Council on Education

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
Completion	10	Analogies	4
Arithmetic	7	Opposites	36
Artificial Language	45	Gross Score	12

Bernreuter Personality Inventory

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
B1-N	55	B4-D	56
B2-S	65	F1-C	43
B3-1	39	F2-S	64

"DEVELOPMENT" AS THE DEVELOPMENT OF SKILL: JULIA

Julia's story is a very simple one; there is no need in this instance to go into great detail. She entered college a very assured and attractive young woman; her background was one of considerable affluence. Her father, a successful businessman, had had ambitions toward medicine or science early in life, and an uncle was a scientist. Julia had spent much of her childhood playing with a very large family of cousins

whose mother was intensely and actively interested in social welfare.

Her freshman-year program was evidently planned in some accordance with suggestions from home. She took an elementary course in economics, an exploratory course in psychology, and biology. There were no personal difficulties during the first year; no temperamental symptoms of protracted adolescence. She had had and continued to have a lively social life which did not interfere in the least with her work. She seemed interested in all her work; she got good reports as far as achievement was concerned; she seemed a model of adjustment to college life. Girls liked her and she made acquaintances, but she had almost no close friends on the campus. Though she participated easily and happily in group discussions, she did not seem to be a part of any group. She found one "pal" whose family name happened to be the same as that of her cousins. She was aloof from campus life, just a little superior, and kept her own social life well apart from campus associations.

From the teachers' point of view, in psychology and economics she became a somewhat difficult problem. By the middle of the year there seemed to be no real sign of development in attitude or thought. Julia did faithfully what she was asked. The quantity of her work was adequate; but none of the content of these two courses seemed to penetrate. Intellectually she was bigoted and badly informed; her conclusions, her arguments, her beliefs were almost all clearly the immature reflections of the point of view of an older generation. They were easily traced to her father or her aunt; in fact she often drew these two sources of authority into discussion. She had no firsthand contact with life outside her family world. She gathered a great deal of information through the year which she organized rather neatly, if superficially, into papers, but there was no indication whatever that Julia had digested this information. She could sometimes give the conclusions of a writer quite clearly; at other times

would completely miss the point because of prejudice. In shaping her opinions neither the information nor the authorities she read had much influence. If a person so young and so attractive could be called smug, she was it.

Toward the end of the year two things occurred which considerably shaped her program for the following year. She became aware that the work in biology meant a great deal more to her than any of her other work. She sensed a difference which she could not fully explain. This was a surprise to her adviser, because her reports from biology had not been really as good as those from economics. Yet, after talking to the girl, the adviser realized that economics meant very little indeed to her. Her work in the biology laboratory had been effective, but not particularly striking in comparison with that of other students, except perhaps for a rather rapid manual dexterity. In class, whenever the instructor turned to lecture, Julia appeared to fall asleep. This became so pronounced during the middle of the year that glandular trouble was suspected. On the other hand, the instructor of biology raised no objection to Julia's going ahead with embryology the following year, for the girl had managed to pass the course with a perfectly adequate standing.

In the psychology course, which emphasized social psychology, Julia had completed several short project papers with no particular indication of real interest. She seemed reluctant to find a subject for a longer project; she much preferred to have one assigned to her. The teacher, however, refused, and urged her to find one herself. Finally, about the middle of the year Julia hit upon a topic that involved one of her most striking prejudices. Stated in an oversimplified form this was: Women are finer, more sensitive beings than Men and Men recognize this. The project consisted in studies of the biographies of certain women and related psychological reading; Julia attempted, of course, to prove her conviction. But in the discussions following the completion of the project the teacher asked Julia if she really thought that

any of her heroines, or women in general, had higher ideals than her own father (whom she idealized and adored); this began to get under the girl's skin. From this time on a slight, but noticeable, flexibility of opinion began to appear.

The experience of reading for this project suggested to the adviser that in the following year Julia might better profit by a wide course of reading, without any direct social attack or theses connected with it. The direct approach to social, economic, and psychological problems had definitely failed their purpose. The girl had scarcely grown in tolerance and, in spite of the slight breakdown of certain prejudices, the main points of her reading in psychology and economics were very often left distorted or unassimilated.

By the autumn Julia had quite clearly made up her mind that she wished to prepare for some sort of scientific work (she may have discussed her program at home)—she would take not only embryology but chemistry also. She was willing however, on the rational theory of balance, to try the course in exploratory reading. The result of this work seemed all to the good. Her extreme loyalty to her family, her class, and her background remained, especially when any very direct or obvious allusion to these parts of her world came up. But through the association in books with a great variety of characters, situations, and environments she developed a larger recognition of the variety of standards and values possible to people. The teacher was able to make Julia somewhat conscious of the limited sphere of her own life; and possibly even got across the notion of other ways of living, of other cultures, without ever attempting to challenge directly the student's fixed prejudices and beliefs. By the end of the year, Julia was at least getting the point of what she read; moreover, she seemed to enjoy the books. No one knows how many of her "convictions" remained completely intact but there is evidence of a growing independence of authority in a paper written without preparation as a five-minute class exercise.

During this year Julia's growth in assurance kept pace with the rapid development of her work in science. She no longer fell asleep in lectures; she was alert and interested most of the time and she discovered her remarkable facility in the laboratory work, both in biology and in chemistry. In the latter subject she had to be pressed to relate her laboratory work to the general reading and she evinced more interest in specific experiments than in their significance to the theory illustrated by them, but she came through the year with an excellent record all round. Her attitude toward teachers, rules, and regulations was one of common-sense acquiescence, but she made a more definite assertion of independence in those areas in which she could make her choices without conflict.

From this point on Julia's scientific interests dominate her college experience with increasing fervor and increasing singleness of direction. She takes beginning German in the third year for its value to her in science; she agrees to follow general advice in taking one course—history and politics—outside the area of her main interest. But she insists on a four-course program if she is to do this; her chief energy she intends to give and does give to experimental zoology and organic chemistry. Her reports indicate that her work in German is fairly good through the year, with much difficulty over pronunciation and a slow but constant gain in ability to read accurately. She needed prodding in the history course, but responded very well and got adequate project papers done. The report in April, however, contains the sentence: "I still feel that your reading interests are too narrow and that the suggestion I made in regard to this in the earlier reports still holds good." There is no evidence that she is ever really interested.

The reports from chemistry and zoology for June of the third year briefly summarize her virtues and defects:

EXPERIMENTAL ZOOLOGY (June 10).—She has worked very hard and successfully throughout the year. Her enthusiasms run high and this characteristic tends to make her spread her interests and

energies so that she is studying several questions at a time. Thus she is apt to form conclusions on insufficient data. She has, however, taken this criticism and made progress in overcoming her weakness in method, and achieved marked success in following through to the end her main experiment of the year. She is inclined to think she had understanding of some theoretical point without appreciating its deeper implications. This all means an eagerness to cover too much ground too rapidly. In spite of these general criticisms her work for the year stands out as excellent in many areas and I wish to congratulate her upon a grand year with great progress.

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY.—Her development throughout the year has been consistent, her laboratory technique is above average, she has a good understanding of the subject, but her written reports still show a very poor control of language. This is a glaring defect and will be a future handicap in making contacts. She should make every effort to develop a written style of greater ease and clarity.

These are interesting to compare with the reports at the end of her final year, which she devoted, with the exception of German, entirely to scientific studies. It will be noted that the tendency to hasty conclusions is still present and her slight tendency to avoid interpretations; the difficulty in reading in German seems also to have remained (in spite of her own insistence to the contrary).

BACTERIOLOGY (June 9).—Her work has been good. She has been able to make good use of her chemical background in approaching some of the problems and her medical interest and hospital experience have served to sharpen her questions. It is my hope that her achievement in science will help her discover and pursue some satisfying work in the future. She must still watch her enthusiasm for scientific discovery and see that it does not drive her to hasty conclusions.

BIOCHEMISTRY RESEARCH.—She has directed her work in studying the ascorbic acid content in rat tissues with good judgment and presented it to the science seminar in a thoroughly satisfactory manner.

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS.—This student has done a very good year's work in this course. At the beginning of the year she had a tendency to treat the material entirely descriptively and not in-

terpret the data obtained and follow them through to conclusions and implied broader relationships. She showed rapid improvement in this. Her effort was consistently even—and the quality and quantity of her work were very satisfactory. Her skill in the laboratory was always at a very high level.

GERMAN II.—The year's work has been satisfactory and I think that Julia should be able to handle any reading she may wish to do for scientific work. She needs to make sure of her simple constructions and to handle her material more literally than she does. She must convince herself that every word should be accurately translated before the sense can be expected to emerge. Her scientific vocabulary is much larger—it is only the constructions which need real care.

An informal interview with one of the science faculty concerning this student in the last year brings to light one or two important facts about her:

Question: What phase of the work interested her the most?

Answer: If she could only operate on an animal day and night, that is all she would ask. Just cut it open and watch what happens. She wouldn't need to eat, drink or sleep.

If you challenge her or suggest implications or the theoretical significance of a problem, she willingly follows.

Question: She would not suggest those herself?

Answer: Yes. She thinks of implications, but during this time you have to hold her hand to keep her going while during the activity you must hold her back. She does it well—handling the animals. I remember one teacher saying, "Isn't it beautiful the way she handles those rats?"

Question: What about books? Does she read with willingness?

Answer: She reads with willingness but not enthusiasm; curious mixture of strange contradictions which most of us have.

If I tried to center her surgery she would go off on other things. Often I would let her go and sometimes I would actually say no.

Question (relative to people on campus): What about her friendships?

Answer: I am not aware of any intimate friendships. This is a hunch. While she is here at college her interest is intellectual on a very energetic program. She antagonizes none. The students all like her but I have felt that they resent some of her operating procedures. Jean, for instance, resented that Julia "just operated" without having in her mind a clearly defined problem which she was investigating. Jean spent endless time convincing herself of

the worthwhileness of a problem before she would use a rat to put it to test. Julia on the contrary was getting tremendous satisfaction from the success of her technique in surgery.

This is about all we know of Julia; she kept her social and personal life increasingly to herself in her years of advanced work. There were no very warm personal friendships with teachers, though she liked all her faculty and they liked her. The remarkable thing about her record is the increasing fixity of interest. She left college with a specific laboratory in mind into which she was determined to gain entrance; she wished to go on working in biological research; yet there was no very clear indication of the problems ahead and in comparison to Jean, another talented research student, there was no attempt at all to consider the place of science in modern society or her own world. In a philosophical sense it would be possible to say that Julia was not really interested in *Science* at all. But she had found a way of life and there was no doubt whatever in anyone's mind that she would live it.

Psychologically Julia's story is an interesting one. The lack of development in the personality was discouraging to certain of her teachers: she did not really become very much aware of the culture in which she lived, of people about her, or of the emotional values in life. She had discovered what she wanted to do, but she remained indifferent to its significance.

Would anyone wish to minimize the value to Julia of her experience in college? It might very well argue, however, the failure of a curriculum to achieve all its aims with all students; or the necessity to admit different aims with different students.

Summary

Julia's record gives no evidence that she was aware of problems in the sense in which Anne, Marian, or Judith was aware of them. She showed no concern about herself or about the lacks which some of her teachers found in her. Perhaps this is the fundamental reason why she did not tackle her

problems, either through understanding them, as Priscilla tried to do, or through solving them actively as we see Virginia doing. Of all the students described here, Julia's experience seems the narrowest, the least productive of self-understanding, emotional maturity, or well-rounded preparation for citizenship or marriage, however well prepared for a job she might be. This result is, of course, what defenders of liberal arts education wish to avoid; it is precisely the result they expect from a purely vocational education.

However, Julia's later history suggests another evaluation. Out of college now for several years, Julia has been happily married to an able surgeon and gives evidence of managing her home and family well. The great satisfaction gained from the opportunity to pursue a strong interest doubtless contributed to the confidence and zest of her own personality and gave a basis for a deep sharing in marriage to a man of similar interests. Our information is not complete on this point, but it is probable that strong satisfaction and confidence in the use of a skill gave her a solid base for later growth.

TEST RECORD FOR JULIA

PRE-COLLEGE RECORD

Name of Test

American Council, Psychological, 1934 Edition: IQ, 116

COLLEGE RECORD

American Council on Education

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
Completion	59	Analogies	90
Arithmetic	56	Opposites	30
Artificial Language	82	Gross Score	70

Bernreuter Personality Inventory

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
B1-N	79	B4-D	42
B2-S	12	F1-C	74
B3-I	68	F2-S	21

*SIBLING RIVALRY AT THE COLLEGE
LEVEL: JUDITH*

The striking thing about Judith's Application Form A is the number of inferences one may draw from it concerning her normal, reasonable, well-adjusted social behavior and attitudes. A successful member of a well-to-do Jewish family in the Middle West, she had held class offices, enjoyed various interests and activities, had no worries and was neither sensitive nor self-conscious. She wrote of herself that she had always tried to get along and make herself comfortable with everyone and was therefore not uncomfortable with people. Her behavior and problems are symbolized by her answer to the question on concentration: she does at times have difficulty; the next question asks how she tries to overcome this—she answers, "by turning off the radio."

Judith was strongly recommended to us by her school, and her advisers considered this college especially suitable because of the opportunities it offers for work in sculpture and music, her main interests. The don's record of her progress during the first year is a vivid account of behavior that differs from Judith's own description of her experience before college. According to the don, she is on the defensive about the college; it is difficult for her to make friends; all year she is, in comparison with other students, alone. She has almost no boy friends; she speaks ironically of this fact. The students appear to her to be "bossy, and dictatorial"; she gathers a kind of contempt for most of the girls along her hall—they are not interested in studying. She gradually builds up a patronizing attitude toward the rest of the class. One day this appears in a particularly obvious series of rudenesses. She apologizes to the teacher and they discuss the fact that Judith feels and is superior to many of the students in her class. The teacher suggests that she change to a more advanced group in some other course. But Judith prefers to

remain where she is—it is good for her to have for once this experience of superiority.

Her “intellectual assurance”—a daring to face the facts of the way she feels and to act upon them—is characteristic of her record from that point on. It was not characteristic of her attitude at the beginning of the year. Then she seemed lost and very timid about economics. For a considerable time she was genuinely puzzled and distressed about her work in sculpture, which grew worse and worse. She showed an extreme sensitiveness to the anti-Semitism she seemed to feel on the campus. One of her friends reported to the don that Judith had said to her in a moment of depression, “I knew that some day I would not be able to associate with Gentiles any longer.” Later in the record this overt expression of sensitiveness does not appear; her feeling is reflected only in an interest in race prejudice or in the awareness of rather elaborated forms of social conflict.

There is no record of her actual behavior in the class and conference in economics. The reports show steady gain and become enthusiastic by March. Her instructor notes “signs of initiative” and comments upon the unusual interest in economic problems; “it is an obvious attempt to satisfy curiosity.” The June report from this course contains an interesting comment: “High-grade work, limited by hesitancy and a certain lack of maturity”; and the instructor adds that Judith “has been surprised by her own ability to handle abstract and concrete materials.”

Two things might be emphasized about the record of this year. The first is that in dropping sculpture and beginning voice study, about which she became enthusiastic, she did not seem concerned over her family’s attitude; she herself appeared to feel no sense of chagrin or enduring sense of failure; the family, on the other hand, was much concerned. The second thing is that, despite the tremendous industry and determination shown all through the year in all three courses, Judith never appeared aggressive in her class be-

havior. She never tried to dominate the group. She never challenged sharply or interrupted or behaved in a manner to attract attention. When she delivered her report to the class toward the end of the year, she was distinctly superior in manner, but she was forced into a defensive position and managed extremely well to parry the attacks on her position without bitterness or signs of hostility.

This is markedly characteristic of Judith in her class behavior in the second year. The instructor in political science describes this in detail. He says that she is outstanding but not in a "transitive sense" a leader. She will often question or quietly interrupt to throw out suggested implications, but never in a challenging or aggressive manner. The class tacitly appears to accept her sincerity and her superiority. When she takes part in argument, or starts on a line of thought, it is as if they all "make way for her." The picture given by a social-science teacher appears to verify this: Judith frequently dissents hesitatingly from "a too easily accepted view" and will often quietly insist upon some point being made more clear, but there is no evidence of any attempt to dominate a group.

There is little material concerning her attitude toward other girls during the second year. Her don feels that she has still comparatively few friends on campus. In the autumn her older sister came East to New York and Judith developed a gay social life with her sister and their friends. Her don observes that she gradually begins to compete with her sister for the favor of some of these friends. Judith tells her don at one time that she has decided clearly about her conduct. If it means losing a man because you don't let him make up to you, then she will let him go; she finds that another comes along very quickly. In this respect, the second year sees a considerably increased social activity, and a consequent increase of assurance, for Judith is more venturesome about making contacts after her sister leaves.

The faculty reports are good to excellent throughout the

second year. All of them mention her unusual intellectual curiosity, her constant industry, and her tenacious pursuit of ideas. The attitude is most vividly stressed by one instructor: "her enthusiasm is greatest for something she can understand, something which puts previous experience in a new perspective." But she is not an impulsive idealist: she will "not allow an alluring set of ideas to change the course of her life more than is easily possible." She draws conclusions, tests out hunches, volunteers to do independent work to a marked extent. "Success is too personal a word" for her attitude toward achievements: "she is pleased at reaching greater clarity." She has a negligible sense of failure—"she is always rather clearly on her way." Her actual ability in writing is slight; but she reads with marked discernment, particularly concrete material, "although she makes a bold attack on abstract material as well." She seldom has perfectionist ideas: "She wanted the right answer, but not in the sense that she wanted it from authority."

Another instructor in social science, later in the year, finds a weakness in her work; in history she is too interested in finding the right answer to complex problems quickly; she is impatient; she tends to want to settle controversial issues (which are very complex) with a formula. But her work is reported "excellent." In voice, her attitude appears to be admirable at first; later, she appears too indifferent to the development of imagination and to interpreting songs herself. The don reports Judith's sharp disagreement with the methods her voice teacher urges her to pursue; she prefers his associate's methods and insists upon following them. She discovers a distinct difference between the two teachers and apparently wishes to turn it into a contradiction. The don comments that this is the second time she has criticized a teacher's methods in the arts; to her, each teacher has been wrong. She has never questioned the methods of any teacher in other, more academic, areas. This may be coincidence, but it may also have significance.

Toward the spring her don reports that Judith again brings up the question of applying to Bryn Mawr for the following year. She is not very certain about it but has it in mind. During the summer, Judith wrote her don that she had applied for admission to Bryn Mawr and had been refused. She gives the most logical reasons for wishing this change, but her letter does not express intense disappointment at the rebuff.

Interests

Her interests in economics during 1935-36 appeared to her don to be concerned with specific rather than general economic problems. In literature, her interests were uneven and impermanent, but constantly exciting to her and apparently very genuine. They ranged from race prejudice and social conflict to subjects connected with religion and philosophy. The interest in ideas increased as the year went on; every new idea was received with intense seriousness. The student's attitude was personal and tenacious. She must think this through, she must carry that further, and so on; for example, in music, she came across the Wagner-Nietzsche letters and read some of them. She concluded immediately that she would have to get at Schopenhauer before she could really understand their full significance. She was determined by the end of the year to take philosophy.

Her interest in art did not reappear during the first year, nor was there any indication that she considered it during the second year. Her interest in music was intense at the beginning of the second year. She worked hard on techniques, and the voice teacher reported that she made an effort to develop her sense of interpretation. This did not, apparently, progress. The disagreement concerning method was settled by continuing the technical work with the associate teacher and singing once a week for the voice teacher who reported that she was not greatly interested in extending her knowledge of important musical literature and she did not take great advantage of the opportunities in New York.

The reports from social philosophy were, however, enthusiastic about her interest, and this is verified by her don who found her deadly serious about all the work in that course. She even went to see the don after classes to find out if she thinks Judith had said the intelligent thing at such and such a point in class discussion. This overanxiety about the nature of her work in this course diminished as the year progressed. She did little writing.

A paper written in March shows that she is greatly impressed with Nietzsche's attack upon "Slave Morality" which he attributes to the Jews. At the end of the year she writes a four-page paper (entirely voluntary) upon "My Position in Society." All year she has been intensely concerned with finding out just where she stands in respect to values, ideals, and social conflicts, and this is her summary of what she has got from the year and from college so far. She lists those values under the topic of liberties that she has found important. She begins with the assumption that she is and wishes to remain at the top of her society. She closes with the conviction that she can help maintain these liberal values (enjoyed, she notes, by only the majority at the top, because of the economic system) and intends to fight the forces opposing them.

In politics, at the beginning of the year she began a project on Imperialism. After working for some time she chose an aspect of the problem that was considered crucial by her instructor, but that Judith considered "a side road," insisting she would have to get over it before she could go on to the main problem. She did complete this part of the project, following specific sources through the mazes of the theory of sovereignty. It was not "altogether unsuccessful." The instructor considered that she lost her way, but he praised the paper. She suggested shifting to another project shortly after this, but soon decided to change the course from politics to history for the second term because history was more closely related to her work in social philosophy. There is no detailed record of this work, but we know that, in the spring, Judith feared

to show the instructor her paper because in it she did not take sides in the social conflict, as she seemed to feel she was expected to do, although there was no objective justification for the feeling.

In answering the question concerning this student's interests, her instructor in social philosophy replies: "She is interested in learning *anything*." Looking back at her Form A, one finds that Judith says, "From my college experience, I would like to gain a greater knowledge of people, to round out my education in all fields and to develop a certain interest which in my case is sculpture." In school she enjoyed languages (French and Spanish) and English literature; she disliked Latin; found Latin, American literature, and American history most difficult; and studied hardest on geometry and Spanish. Her mother states that her dominant interests are "General Education, Sports, Sculpture and Music." Her prospective program for freshman year was sculpture, history of art, English novel, and singing.

It is rather a singular fact that the interest in sculpture has so abruptly disappeared. Her "interest in people" has not literally been followed up except through literature; philosophy and politics, with a fairly strong academic emphasis, have emerged as the significant points in her work during the second year.

Judith's prospective program for the third year (there was every reason from the reports that she should continue with the four years toward the A.B.) was as follows: comparative study of political institutions; eighteenth-century English and French literature; biology, human and general; voice. There is no record of the don's suggestions, but the running record indicates that the don agrees with this program in the second and third items above. The fourth remained to be arranged by the Music Department in some other way. Her situation at the end of her second year may be summarized as follows:

Academic Needs

1. Both her don and her history teacher felt that Judith should now concentrate on "learning" more, even, as her don puts it, "at the sacrifice of some of the deep thinking she has been doing."

2. It is apparent that the girl has had little training in writing; she needs much more of it if she is to go on with solid projects.

3. With her initially expressed interest in art and the history of art, it would be reasonable to suggest that her attention be called to the significance of art in her studies of the history of culture.

Emotional Needs

1. A desire for friends with similar or equal intellectual motivation. Possibly the opportunities for responsibility in campus activities might compensate? (Or, perhaps, some sense of share in problems concerning the student body.)

2. A continual satisfaction of what three teachers have called unusual "intellectual curiosity."

3. A constant desire to take all her learning in terms of what it can do for her.

Hypotheses

I. This student's difficulties at the beginning of college were simply the result of a sudden change to a new environment in which her social position was insecure and the standards of Eastern girls unfamiliar. Her sense of insecurity was also partly the result of misguidance by her family into an area (sculpture) of not very real interest. Through her work in literature first, and later in economics, she found areas of interest that were exciting to her natural, though latent, intellectual curiosity. She had previously been so well adjusted socially, so secure, and so able that she did not have to worry about "standing" well in school; and it may be as-

sumed that the approach to subjects within the school was such as not to excite her curiosity—perhaps there was not enough emphasis upon ideas. Following the separation from her family and circle of friends, the pressure to find herself in this strange environment called out all her innate resources, and the difficulties of social adjustment added just the pressure needed to discover her intellectual abilities. This marked the awakening of her intellectual curiosity. She discovered her mistaken interest in sculpture, which had previously, we must assume, been little more than a play interest.

On this hypothesis the energy devoted to intellectual studies is partly to be accounted for by the lack of social life and the insecurity in relation to her contemporaries. The reason this continues might be conjectured to lie partly in the fact that she has discovered that she really is different from, and to a considerable extent superior to, these associates. Her interest in Bryn Mawr is justified by her wish to enlarge her knowledge of types of people; to discover, further, how students who have a motivation equal to hers take their education; to broaden the range of her contacts beyond that of the limited economic group at Sarah Lawrence. On this hypothesis also, the lack of interest in sculpture and the lessening of interest or satisfaction in singing may be explained by the fact that these are considered less intellectual and are to be understood less in merely intellectual terms.

II. Judith's defensive attitude, so noticeable at the beginning of college, is to be explained by three main factors.

1. She has come to a college which she considers a little less respectable than Bryn Mawr where her sister went; she comes here because she is the less bright member of the family—not the intellectual that her sister is.

2. She does not find the "intellectual friends" found by her sister in Bryn Mawr because she is convinced that they do not exist in a college of second-class intellectual standing.

3. In this strange environment she is aware for the first time of a sense of both racial and social inferiority that she

may have experienced in childhood but that her family and circle of friends had helped her repress. She discovers that it does matter that she is a Jewess and that she is from the West and not "up on the correct things."

The experience in the literature class gives her very soon a new compensation for this lack of protection and recognition. She finds that she can read, analyze, and criticize more readily than most of the girls in the class, and discovers this to be true also in economics. With this realization a new hope dawns—perhaps she is not less bright than the older sister; perhaps she, too, can find intellectual excitement. The interest in sculpture which had characterized her difference from the sister at home suddenly disappears and a strong curiosity about intellectual things takes its place: for example, in literature, the religion and fatalism in Hardy; the Wagner-Nietzsche letters in music (accompanied by the gesture that she must get at Schopenhauer). She is skeptical about voice but takes it up because she likes music and partly, too, because music holds eminent repute in her family.

On this hypothesis the underlying drive through the end of the first year and all through the second consists of getting enough knowledge not only to be an intellectual, but to prove to herself that she is one, and to compensate for new insecurities in the social field. She chooses one of the most eminently intellectual teachers on the campus to learn from. I believe that she literally thinks of the work in this course as learning to think, to face problems, to discover the intellectual method. She is bright enough really to learn the method of this teacher, though she suffers considerable anxiety in the process and has to rely upon assurance from her don that she did say the right thing or think the right thing in class. She catches the point of intellectual honesty even in the first year, and applies it to her own efforts as best she can. Why? Because this is being a thinker. Hence she will not fool herself, will not tumble for "a set of alluring ideas"; she will be really a thinker, and being one, she will beat her sister

at her own game and will show the Gentiles what she can do.

In this connection her success is tremendously encouraged during the early part of the second year by the fact that she can actually compete with her sister for the attention of men. Here, too, she takes the more intelligent gamble; she will turn men down if she can hold them only by allowing them to play up to her; she can get another man, and she does.

The first hypothesis has several implications: that Judith's curiosity is natural, disinterested, and once awakened should grow; that she can continue under increasing discipline to a mastery of some academic field.

Moreover, on the basis of this hypothesis she should probably be encouraged to pursue "intellectual" subjects beyond undergraduate years in college and to fit her feminine role to this pattern. It implies that her talents and her interests do not run in the direction of the arts and consequently that her earlier enthusiasm for sculpture was essentially specious or transitory.

I would like to raise questions about every one of these points: particularly about the "natural" source of anything so complicated as "intellectual curiosity." I do not see any evidence whatever for the assumption that the kind of curiosity that this girl shows will grow. It may and it may not. I am not at all certain what the subjection to academic disciplines will do to her, say, two years from now.

The second hypothesis implies that she will submit to academic disciplines just as long as the basic motives (sibling rivalry and compensation for social inferiority) remain unsatisfied. It does not imply anything like "disinterestedness" in any radical sense in this girl's interest. One of the most provocative questions raised in the questionnaire is that of "Interest in the Useful." To answer this in respect to Judith appears difficult or impossible. One instructor surmounts this difficulty by qualifying the phrase as "Useful for way of life." Quibbling over terms is not important; the fact that this student's record practically forces one to quibble in respect

to this question is significant. Others that I have studied have not done so.

The second hypothesis does not imply academic graduate study; yet it does allow for it if either one of the motivations remains alive and driving. It does not imply a necessary conflict between a feminine role and advanced study. Concerning the early interest in art it implies nothing more than that this represents a compensatory means of saving Judith's face in a family situation where the intellectual honors or gifts are supposedly out of her grasp. It is by no means certain whether or not she has talents or capacities in the arts; she may have.

The first hypothesis does not explain several important points which have heretofore not been stressed: the fact that Judith emphasizes "fairness" in her discussion of the question of control for the younger generation; the fact that in answering a test question she postulates ideals for what one would want out of life as "security, full freedom of expression, recognition"; the fact that she takes from Nietzsche mainly his attack upon "Slave Morality" for her discussion in a paper written in March; the fact that she entitles her valedictory paper at the end of the year "My Position in Society" and then proceeds to emphasize the assumption that she is and will continue to be "At the Top"; that she can help by defending freedom and can save her soul by "fighting" against the barriers which are put up so that "the masses may," when they bring about a "historical change," have these liberal ideals to choose from. It is particularly interesting that, after two years of economic and social theory, she misses the inner contradiction of this position even while mentioning the economic system that prevents the majority from enjoying the liberties she values.

The sibling rivalry, together with the social or racial inferiority, explains, it seems to me, the driving motive for all this intense intellectual activity. Judith must emphasize fair-

ness as an ideal; she is perfectly expressing her needs when she postulates "security," "freedom for expression," and "recognition" as ideals in life. Very probably she has never had enough of any of these in the family circle; she is just now finding her chance to get them. No wonder she is impressed by the attack on "Slave Morality"—she might almost have called it "Home Morality"—loving thy sister as thyself. Having started upon this aggressive sublimation of very natural impulses, she is constantly under the urge to find where she is, because above all she must not fool herself; she *must* write upon "My Position"—*now*. It is equally necessary to find herself at the top, and there is good reason for her to know she is there—at the present.

This hypothesis also explains the failure in sculpture: it was not a competitive area; it was not intellectual. Voice is acceptable in so far as technique gives her power. Her disagreement with her voice teacher appears to lie largely in this, that his emphasis all year has been laid not on technique but on interpretation—the development of imagination, feeling, letting herself go. But her weapon is her mind and her arena of struggle is argument, method of study, achievement. How can she relax, let herself go, give herself to imaginative flights until she is in a sure, safe position? She can sing for approval, but she cannot bother to enlarge her knowledge of musical literature just now. She cannot stop to "cultivate" feeling and response to the subtle attitudes and complexities of art; the compulsion to prove to herself that she is on top in the area of rational knowledge is too strong.

In spite of her good mind, her attempt to settle questions quickly (noticed by her history teacher) seems to me to indicate the need to believe in the power of reason, intellectuality, over anything else. Reason is power for this girl in the sense that it is the thing that can tell her where she stands now and where to move next. The exaggerated way in which she apparently assumes in all her work that all ques-

tions have and must have a correct answer, not necessarily an easy one, seems to me the key to the whole situation. In this sense she is very keenly interested in power.

At the end of the year she agrees with her don that she now needs content, more learning. She will forsake social philosophy next year and read. She must acquire the concrete foundation for further speculation; she must entrench and fortify herself after victory. Her prospective registration for next year has been given: she will continue the technique of voice not under the same teacher, with his emphasis upon interpretation and imagination. She will adventure into the natural sciences; she will read in the eighteenth century, which holds an inexhaustible supply of intellectual materials. But she does not give up social science after all; she goes back to the political subject matter dropped at mid-years: "Political Institutions." She cannot let alone that sphere of eminent domain.

It seems to me that there is a real want in this girl's learning which should not be neglected—at least it should be called to her attention. Accepting her motivation, she badly needs more study of human conduct; she needs to comprehend the psychological as well as social and political forces that move people. Two of the most important questions which she herself asks in a paper for her course in social philosophy drive right at this point. She asks, "Where does prejudice arise?" and "What determines what social movements an individual allies himself with and how do the elements of adventure, possibility of success, social justice, etc., enter into it?" She appears not to have the remotest idea of the direct line of inquiry—psychology.

It does not seem to me that this student will be free enough to achieve disinterested intellectual curiosity—the liberal academic ideal—until she can answer these questions in respect to herself. But I am by no means sure that the cultivation of such an abstraction is a worthwhile intellectual goal. I know of no other current record of educational experience

which shows such a completely "integrated" character as this one of Judith, in this sense: everything she does is related to her specific needs as she sees them and as they appear inferentially through her behavior. But it does not appear to me that further manipulation of theory or even the acquisition of facts will give this student the high sense of power she really is striving for. Only the fuller understanding of herself can do this. Her conscious rationality is the heaviest barrier she has to overcome. She does not seem to me to exhibit neurotic traits which will prevent the gradual recognition of her motives if the opportunities for the studies of motives are given her. If she refuses these opportunities because she can't face them, she is less free than the records at this time imply.

The attempt to enter Bryn Mawr appears to me to confirm the hypothesis of sibling rivalry as a primary motivation. Her refusal there must have been indeed a serious blow. It will be interesting to observe what defenses against this she may discover.

In conclusion I would like to call attention to the extremely feminine character of this student's reactions to learning. There seem to me no instances of idealization of a professional career; she does not behave in a masculine manner toward the class groups or toward the demands in various courses. I do not think the reactions to her instructors in art have anything particular to do with the fact that they are men. It is enough that the arts have been put in a second place—definitely second rate—by the attitude of her family and her own feeling that she was coming to a second-rate college where they were taught. Her reaction to "first rate" subjects and her realization of success with them is enough to establish her indifference to the arts. I do not see any evidence for her thinking that the arts are associated with women and not men, are "sissy" and the like. We must also remember that the sister who is, according to my hypothesis, serving as an ideal for Judith appears to have an active social life and nor-

mal reactions to the opposite sex. Thus there appears no reason to feel that Judith will face a conflict between her academic ideals and her role as a woman.

Judith's intellectual interests waned toward the end of her college life. Shortly after graduation she married and was happy to have a child the following year. It still remains for the future to tell whether her intellectual activities in college served purposes beyond reassurance that she could compete on her sister's ground. [Postscript by L.B.M.]

Summary

In the light of her post-college behavior, Judith's whole college experience through four years might appear to be an elaborate defense or proof of her ability. First she concentrated on one of the arts to prove that she had brains despite her supposed limitations in intellectual ability in comparison with an older sibling. Then she discovered that she could think after all and abandoned the arts for more intellectual pursuits. Meantime she had also had uncertainties about her attractiveness to men and when these disappeared so that marriage seemed a real possibility, her devotion to intellectual activities went the way of her early attachment to the arts. A final evaluation of this story must wait for evidence on what kind of marriage she makes and what kind of citizen she is. At present college may be said to have provided the steps, however devious they may seem, to a needed security in heterosexual relationships.

TEST RECORD FOR JUDITH

PRE-COLLEGE RECORD

<i>Name of Test</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>IQ</i>
Otis S.A. Higher	42	112
Otis S.A. High Form A	53	114

COLLEGE RECORD

American Council on Education

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
Completion	10	Analogies	15
Arithmetic	12	Opposites	49
Artificial Language	24	Gross Score	19

Bernreuter Personality Inventory

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
B1-N	34	B4-D	75
B2-S	26	F1-C	26
B3-1	19	F2-S	16

THERAPEUTIC USES OF THE CURRICULUM: PATSY AND ANNE

THESE TWO SUMMARIES present sharply contrasting illustrations of ways in which the curriculum may function or fail to function so as to meet the deeper needs of the student. Patsy illustrates what can be done when flexible program planning permits the prescription of exactly the course needed for release of a student's powers. Anne's therapeutic curriculum was found in another institution, as her need as a "scattered" student was for an external structure or pattern which the very flexibility of the work at this college failed to give her.

BELATED SELF-DISCOVERY: PATSY

Patsy came from a very conventional background, and was herself a very conventional person. Her mind was filled with proper loyalties, ideals, ethical seriousness. She anticipated college somewhat under the shadow of an older sister who was an alumna and had given her directions about courses and people. This was a little embarrassing for a few of the faculty who had known the older sister because it was obvious that Patsy was quite a different sort of person. She had a slow, rather deep and quiet charm which ran a little counter to expressions of extravagant enthusiasm. She was obviously interested in her social life outside of college, but quite definitely thought of it as completely separate and nobody's business. I would not like to infer that she was socially ambitious; her family were too secure for that. Social life was merely part of her proper conventional world; she spontaneously enjoyed it and during the first two years of college she was having to find her proper place in it.

The program settled on was a model of theoretical balance.

An exploratory course in social science with a good deal of field work and of social, economic, and psychological problems constituted the main content of the course. To this was added an introductory course in the arts, not in studio but in appreciative study of the theatre, music, dance, and fine art; and third choice was an introductory course in American literature.

The initial reports all showed interest in Patsy as a person and all were just a little equivocal about her work. As one teacher put it, "Her strength lies in her earnestness and human sympathy rather than in her power of analysis." By the middle of the year the reports from American literature and social science were fairly discouraging. The work was very uneven; there was great difficulty in getting written work done. Patsy had shown enthusiasm in spots, striking observation at times on field trips, an interest in ideas in the reading in American literature, but had accomplished little organized work of any kind. Her participation in discussion in the arts course was excellent, but again there was little sign of consistent work. She was intelligent and sensitive, and reflective to an astonishing degree. Nothing she did in any course was in the least superficial, but she did not carry her promise into achievement.

When pressure was brought to bear all round, she picked up rapidly and by the end of the year got fairly good reports, with the exception that every report save the one from arts referred to the necessity of driving her. It was remarked that both social life and illness (sinus trouble and colds) had partly accounted for her lack of effort during the middle of the year; but there was no clear evidence that her social life was an all absorbing passion as in the case of certain other students. A wedding, a family function of one sort or another would assume great importance for the moment and require a long week end, but no one thought that the trouble really lay here. Patsy was simply indifferent to punctual demands. Only in one spot during the year had there appeared really consistent

work and that was in the laboratory dissection as part of the unit in biology connected with the exploratory course in social science. Here she seemed to function with all her energy. Papers and theoretical conclusions might be late or fragmentary, but in the laboratory things were done with precision, skill, and concentration.

Her choice of program for the second year seemed logical and to have a clear direction. It included a course on the family (primarily psychological study), a course each in economics and piano. The latter had quite clearly come out of her work in introductory arts; the other two followed divergent tangents from the introduction to social science. Her adviser expected a development of real interest, and though difficulties with writing were anticipated there seemed no reason why she could not do sustained work.

The expected results appeared, however, only in the course in economics. Patsy showed great interest in the course on the family and was a striking member of the group, often contributing fine pieces of analysis to the discussion. She accomplished two papers, but though they contained interesting ideas and occasional illuminating comments they were not models of organization. The better of the two papers was a study of men and women in various modern novels. On the whole her work had appeared uneven in this course. In piano, she worked at an uneven pace and in a plodding manner. She consistently enticed the teachers into discussion of ideas, sometimes at just the points where technical difficulties appeared. During the middle of the year there was an all-round slump similar to that in the previous year. Her work in elementary economics progressed most steadily, perhaps because it was the most solidly organized course and proceeded with short, precise assignments and very careful supervision of written projects. Her June reports were fair, but two of them carried qualifications.

There seemed to be no doubt as to her interest in music or even of its value to her, but she showed insufficient sta-

bility for good results; she would lose herself in detail, concentrate on fragments, and never seemed able to see or feel a single work as a whole. In psychology she gained in self-confidence, but a report of a field project on the study of one child, for whom she cared one afternoon a week, was left unfinished.

I wish [said the teacher] that she had worked somewhat more consistently, for she could have gained even more than she did from the year's experience in this course. Patsy gave the impression of an able girl with imagination and genuine reflective powers who never seemed to live up to her potential capacities. Outwardly she seemed independent and responsible, but she had continually to be prodded.

She had long conferences with her adviser. It was as if, to get much done, she relied upon being driven and upon serious talks with her adviser about her work.

The earlier sense of direction seemed to disappear; the logic of the selection of courses for the second year had not really brought evidence of development. It was not that the girl was failing, but that no real independence emerged; she seemed still the schoolgirl with a grown-up exterior—in short, a very dependent personality. For example, she had not found in economics any real motivation for further study. She was, she said, excited about music, yet the range of her taste still lay in a fairly narrow area of nineteenth-century romantic material. She had made little effort to explore other fields of musical literature: Chopin, Tschaikowsky, Debussy seemed completely to satisfy her. In spite of what appeared to be a genuine interest in children arising from her work in the study of the family, the adviser was not entirely convinced that the interest was real enough to carry independent work. However, this field gave the best chance of motivation then apparent.

For the third year, then, Patsy continued her work in music agreeing that it would be a good idea to concentrate on work in theory, ear training, and analysis of symphonies while

continuing the piano on part time. She entered the psychology seminar, which combined some theoretical reading with actual work with children and observation of them in the nursery school. For her third subject, literature was considered and a teacher was chosen who would be willing to work patiently with her on very specific analysis of books, in the hope that Patsy would acquire the discipline of sharp observation in reading and a richer appreciation of specific and detailed content.

Everything went very well for the first six weeks or so. What she completed for psychology was very good, though the quantity of written work remained meagre. She was enthusiastic about the literature course, and there was no doubt whatever of her pleasure in the reading and her excitement over the ideas encountered. In music, she was beginning to develop considerable precision of ear and there were signs of a much surer integration of mind and muscle. But about Christmas time or a little before, precisely the same history repeated itself. The January reports were the most severe she received since her entrance. The psychology report ended with the sentence "A conference of the Seminar's faculty will be needed to decide whether her work can be credited as meeting the requirements of a full time course at a third year level." The report from literature ended, "I could not possibly rate her standing in this course at present as of college grade"; from music, "It is almost impossible to give you a report. You have done so little since November, not because you are incapable—as your performance of the Schumann indicated—but because you seem incapable of any concentrated, consecutive drive. It seems strange to be saying this again in your third year."

Talks with the adviser and with each of the teachers did not reveal any very good cause for the failure. Patsy had been excited and interested in her older sister's marriage; she had carried a good many social functions during the autumn, but by no means enough to warrant such a break in her work. She

gave the impression really of being indifferent to all of her work; though when specific matters were discussed she appeared to be, and insisted that she was, interested. She continued to take a lively part in discussion in the literature group, often being one of the chief contenders or defenders on some point. The teacher, however, had the impression that much of this was a love of argument for its own sake; Patsy seemed to enjoy the opportunity to vent in intellectual combat a certain undercurrent of hostility that was otherwise very well concealed. The teacher's notes are interesting for their record of the complete failure in Patsy's case of methods in the training of observation that worked well with the rest of the group. He decides at about this point to take her on her own terms—to follow up her profession of interest in certain abstract ideas in one novel; to ask her to study these chapters in detail and summarize the philosophical arguments of three characters.

The up-swing was slower in this third year, but she did achieve it. She got fair reports for March and very good ones indeed for June. In the literature course she completed the analytical paper and made a job of it that surprised the teacher, though she had gone through procrastinations and extra conferences that were a strain on his patience. For psychology she finished the first really mature paper she had done in college. Organization was finally achieved, and the material was firsthand, original, and striking. The paper concerned a study of children's responses to music, rhythm, and so on; it was based on actual experience with children in the nursery school and integrated the two fields of work in her program. It was very nearly a first-rate job, but was pedantic and stilted in expression. The instructor in literature had tried various techniques to improve her writing, but he had failed with all of them up to the presentation of the final paper on the philosophical ideas in the novel. This appeared simply written, straightforward and without awkwardness. It was almost inexplicable except for Patsy's statement that it had

been written right out of her head, almost straight off, and without reworking. She had tried and tried she said and then it had all come clear when she made herself put it down. She seemed at once exhausted and triumphant, and very anxious about the results.

Because of the reality of the work achieved before the end of the year the committee judging student work acquiesced in her return for the senior year, but not without great misgiving. Two new suggestions for a change of program had appeared during the year. Another instructor had taken part of one period of the literature class when a discussion of Thomas Mann's *Magic Mountain* was in process. Patsy was almost inspired by this guest instructor's talk and was absolutely certain that she wished to take his half-philosophical, half-literary study of Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, and Thomas Mann the following year. When she had first mentioned the notion it had seemed fantastic, but after the analytical paper on the abstract ideas in the novel, it seemed a possibility worth trying.

During the early part of the year, before the serious slump in work had occurred, Patsy and the instructor in literature had indulged in a rambling discussion of various forms of art. She had remarked in this discussion, in passing, that literature had always seemed to her remote and derivative, never direct in its appeal. The instructor had asked her if she did not think that meaning was communicated directly in literature, but only inferentially in the plastic arts or music. She had very decidedly disagreed with this: "Words," she had said, were "in the way," whereas a sound or a piece of stone were direct, "they could hit you—a word, never." In a talk with the girl's adviser in the late spring the teacher had suggested taking this remark of Patsy's quite seriously; he had gone so far as to suggest trying sculpture to the student. She admitted that she had always—or at least for a long time—had a hankering to do so, but had never had the courage and,

when she came to college, had not thought of sculpture as an honest-to-goodness college subject. Of course she had now given up that conventional notion, she said, but still, she had not had the courage to consider it.

The adviser and the teacher went back over the girl's record. They noted the active excitement of laboratory work in biology in freshman year, but the indifference to biology as a science. They noted the apparent stumbling with formal expression all the way through. They noted the apparent ease with certain harmonic exercises in music theory during the third year. They noted the flashes of intuitive insight in psychology and also in literature—the sensing of a pattern or a relationship with unmistakable brilliance but with complete inability to carry out these flashes in discussion or in organized written work. Both felt the genuineness and charm of the student and both admitted that her education to date was pretty nearly a failure; only charm and earnestness had carried the girl this far. They decided to urge her to try the suggestion of sculpture, especially as the interest in continuing study of child psychology seemed just a little artificial.

What happened may be inferred from the following reports which give the main points of her development through the year:

THOMAS MANN (Nov. 22).—Satisfactory work.

SCULPTURE.—You are the perfect example of a fourth-year student. You have a sane approach to a new subject and seem to interpret it in the light of past experience. I enjoy your contributions to the class discussions. Keep up the good work.

PIANO.—Thus far a successful season. It is the first time since we have been working together that you have learned completely two compositions by mid-November.

On the other hand your work in the group is less successful. Mr. L. finds you responsive in class, always apparently interested in your work, a characteristic apparent for four years. However, he would be interested in finding out when you do your work for him. Is it just before the class? You had difficulty in playing a simple chord cadence that was in a recent assignment.

Perhaps, here again, we are meeting a former problem—keyboard insecurity from lack of consecutive work over a long period of time?

DON REPORT (Dec. 16).—The discovery of sculpture has been tremendously satisfying for Patsy. She wants to go on with it next year in New York or Paris. Her satisfaction in working with ideas was expected and follows directly from observations of her speculative trend from freshman year on. The interest in sculpture has for the moment displaced her earlier ideas of going into work with music, possibly with children, and seems to contain the germ of a more consistent drive than the former plan offers.

SCULPTURE (Feb. 1).—In the clay work you were interested and the work showed it; in the plaster you were ready to quit at one time and the work showed it; by working through this last problem you have discovered that one can revive interest, and again I think the work shows it. So you are doing good work and learning something, too. I hope you keep it up.

THOMAS MANN.—Obviously at home with these materials, she works easily and appreciates many of the nicer implications of her reading. She is a much better student than she appeared to be at the time of my first report.

PIANO.—The work in all directions, both piano and group, has improved. Your teacher finds your work prepared and satisfactory. I find that your work at the keyboard *has at last broken through*. The fact that for the first time at college you were able to play successfully before a group of your fellow students in the Piano Club is the most significant step forward that you have made in four years.

There is every indication that this steady work will continue. There has been no sign of the characteristic letdown. *Keep at it*.

SCULPTURE (June 9).—Patsy started to work in sculpture for the first time this year. She has proved herself to be an intelligent and an imaginative student. I should expect no better work from a student who had been studying sculpture for four years.

This last piece of work has not been especially a success, but the student has learned so much that it is perfectly natural that she should have a little time to absorb what she has learned. The work has proved to the student that it takes time and experience to be able to do one's best.

THOMAS MANN.—An excellent year's work.

PIANO.—Throughout this year this student's work in piano has differed immeasurably from previous years. It has been charac-

Summary

Patsy is one of the students who had no obvious problems outside of college; social life and family relationships were not a major source of strain nor could they explain her repeated failure to fulfill the promise which her teachers saw in her. The problem was in herself, in her relation to work, and the solution of her problem was found in releasing her for new freedom and courage; this release was accomplished by the discovery of the curricular area which spoke her language.

From the first she had showed a combination of ideals, reserve, and strong feeling which is not uncommonly accompanied by an ambivalent desire for and fear of direct contact, sometimes also a fear of getting deeply and thoroughly

TEST RECORD FOR PATSY

PRE-COLLEGE RECORD

<i>Name of Test</i>	<i>IQ</i>
Stanford-Binet	134
Dearborn	130
Otis	116
American Council on Education	
	<i>Score</i> <i>Percentile</i>
1st trial	119 21
2d trial	158 26

COLLEGE RECORD

American Council on Education

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
Arithmetic	7	Artificial Language	36
Opposites	7	Analogies	90
Completion	5	Total	16

Bernreuter Personality Inventory

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
B1-N	87	B2-S	7

into anything. Her first three years were years of ups and downs, apparent responsiveness and eagerness about ideas, with difficulties in carrying through her plans to completion. After a teacher discovered her feeling that a sound or a piece of stone "could hit you—a word, never," her program was planned to include sculpture, a field she had always wanted to try but had not thought proper for college work. The effect of this was as dramatic as the effect, on some people, of marriage, or a decision to leave home and plan one's own life. Patsy not only worked with excitement in sculpture but sustained a new level both of quantity and quality in the rest of her work through the year. It looked as if release from her inhibition had helped to engender a general freedom and courage to attack realities of work in all areas.

A "SCATTERED" STUDENT: ANNE

This very short story reflects the virtue and the vice of the flexible curriculum, the individual conference method, and the excessive demand for independent work inevitable under such conditions. At the same time it illustrates the limitations of a certain kind of character which, in greater or less degree, is a constant problem in the progressive college, because that college tends to attract this type.

Anne began college with a carefully considered program. Music with particular emphasis upon singing was her avowed dominant interest; but the faculty she talked with during registration had little difficulty encouraging her to try a varied program. She took a so-called "exploratory" course in psychology, an introductory course in international relations, and dramatics. Her preliminary reports were good, all round. She seemed to be an alert, outgoing, vital sort of person with flashes of insight and an eagerness to participate in class discussion. Her striking appearance and impulsive manner brought her quickly to the attention of her faculty and her classmates.

By Christmas time the work in international relations proved to be less interesting to her than the other work and there appeared good reason to change this subject in favor of introductory work in the theory of music which would include some elementary musical composition. She, herself, had indicated the advisability of this change by sacrificing the preparation of classwork when the demands of dramatics for the fall production became so heavy as to demand sacrifice somewhere.

On the other hand, dramatics itself seemed to be taking too much of her time away from music and the psychology course in which her interest was growing. The arrangement with regard to dramatics had been a flexible one; she was taking it mainly for what it would contribute to her work in voice and she was to be left free to choose what amount of time she would spend on it. She had plunged into it with considerable assurance and enthusiasm but had been quite shocked by receiving rather pointed criticism. Her report had said:

She is beginning to acquire techniques, and the preparation for *Trafalgar* showed how badly she needs a deeper and more profound approach to creating a personality. Although Anne has a certain flair for characterization, the old lady was done in a superficial manner. Considering the change in Anne's habits of work she did well, I think, and the progress made would show up in doing a second role.

Psychology and music were considered more important to Anne for the time being and there was no resistance to the suggestion of dropping dramatics after January. Her program from there on consisted in the three subjects: psychology, voice, and the theory of music.

The March reports indicated the apparent wisdom of this change for they were very encouraging indeed, particularly in the theory of music, where Anne showed so pronounced a facility in grasping the elementary technique of composition that the instructor discussed with her quite seriously the

prospect of going ahead with composing as a long-continued study in college. In psychology, too, she continued to read with "penetrating insight," but found generalizing difficult and getting things down on paper more difficult still. Yet the June reports in all three subjects were glowing: the work in music was said to be

Outstanding for the year—she has an intuitive perception of musical and vocal ideas and works with an economy of motion which startles one . . . if this student continues to develop confidence in herself as a person and tolerance towards others so that she makes friends easily, she should become an outstanding student in the college. She has unusual ability.

Of her development toward maturity her adviser and faculty were also greatly encouraged. There was a history of considerable friction with the mother; there was a severe shock at the father's death. There had been some difficulty with discipline and an increasing sense of uncertainty as she did not prove the social success with adolescents which her mother had hoped she would. The girl was conscious of a great deal of this and had definitely asked the psychology teacher for light on her problems. Some time had been spent studying the character of various women in novels during the year with a view to encouraging tolerance and understanding in Anne's mind toward people different from herself, and particularly toward her mother.

Of the experience in this course her teacher writes:

Anne's work in the class was of chief importance to her from a social point of view. She felt insecure at the outset; was pleased and touched to find herself appreciated in the class and this remained an important value for her. She undertook no field work and resisted the dissection work in the Biology Laboratory because of her strong feelings about dead bodies, and her chief individual work consisted of one contract analyzing personalities of women in American novels and the backgrounds of their frustrations, and another contract in which she got acquainted with the main ideas of Freud, Jung, and Adler. Both of these had many implications for her personal problems. Since much of the ma-

terial is confidential, it is not desirable to give a detailed account of it here.

Her adviser in June further elaborates the picture of the student:

A very dynamic person with flashes of intuitive perception which continually startle one. She began the year with great enthusiasm but with none of the tools or sense of organization by which one appraises one's findings and coordinates them into a single structural whole. In her singing or in her musical theory, she would so quickly catch an idea as to seem almost to anticipate the instructor's suggestions. I would be certain that she so completely absorbed a point that she would not fail to see later its connection with other subsequent ideas. To my dismay she would, when the time came, not only miss the connection, but seem to have forgotten the earlier point. Other teachers had similar experiences with her in musical composition and in social science.

I found it necessary to remind myself continually that Anne was, after all, working without tools and with such quick penetration that self-discipline in the way of consistent and connected endeavor together with searching self-criticism had never seemed to her important up to then.

Then, too, her most pressing problem being one of insecurity in her personal relationships, it seems logical that at the outset her respect and affection had to be won before actually getting at the business of analyzing her own needs for an honest criticism of her brilliant but very uneven performances.

Anne, however, is fundamentally a person of integrity, and once convinced that she had the friendship of her instructors, she proved she could take criticism and even began to scorn what she discerned to be mediocre in her work and refused to offer it for criticism. It is particularly hard for a student of Anne's quickness to go through the day-by-day agony of mastering techniques in the arts a step at a time, but during the spring term she seemed to see the need and apply herself with greater regularity and patience. She lost her exhibitionistic tendencies as her feeling toward music became more genuine.

She is still harrowed, I believe, by her inability to attract and hold the friendship of men and girls her own age, but she is finding that through respect for her intellectual and artistic achievements, she has already made a certain place for herself on the

campus and she feels that through her own development worthwhile relationships outside college are more apt to come about. She has also, she tells me, for the first time, been finding interesting qualities in others who did not, on meeting, at all attract her.

It seems to me, her program has been well chosen up to now. She seems to have a rather unique combination of the intellectual and artistic. Next year, however, I believe she should, with this year's start, spend not more than a third of her time in music and work profitably in three fields. She really should be stimulated to demand far more of herself since she has such ability. I consider her prospective program with Social Philosophy, individual writers (Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, Joyce, *et al.*), and the music department well advised.

Anne has had as much donning from her Psychology teacher as from me, I am certain. At first she looked for authority and direction but very quickly assumed responsibility and made independent judgments. Our relationship has seemed to me very free and mutually valuable. I am not particularly concerned about her relationship to her mother. From two letters I have had from her this summer, I gather they are more companionable, but that Anne sees her quite realistically.

It is well to observe at this point that the program she chose for the second year might be termed, in campus lingo, "very highbrow," indeed. She had decided not to go ahead with the musical composition, and she had not revived an interest in dramatics. Social science did not sufficiently interest her to go ahead with any specific course, such as further work in psychology or economics or politics. But she is attracted by the course in social philosophy and by the course in literature, which was more than half philosophical. It must also be noted that the teachers of these two courses had immense prestige on the campus. Her work in singing she still considered most important to her.

By December the report from voice refers to a technical lapse and further comments, "She is far too promising and capable a student to be satisfied with superficial readings which stem from a very dramatic personality and not as yet often enough from the structure of the music or text or genu-

ine feeling for them." A month later the report from the same teacher strikes a genuine note of disappointment and hints at disillusion. He writes:

Anne is a challenging person with a quick and able mind who, as she says, sees no reason why she should discipline it to the full. "Has it ever occurred to you," she said to me the other day, "that I may not want to do anything as well as I could if I worked harder than I do? Are people necessarily happier for worrying so about all the world's problems?" Last year she made me feel that her emotional turmoils arising out of social insecurity might explain the unsteadiness of her intellectual drive. Her relationship to her mother, to her home city circle, and to the Sarah Lawrence student body has improved vastly. She is not nearly so prone to emotional turbulence of speech or action and still she hadn't up to Christmas time seemed to really tackle intellectual problems.

She has great respect for the conventional type of authority. It is imperative for her to feel that a faculty member whom she respects, likes and respects her. She spoke to me about her philosophy in late October, perfectly seriously: "I can't make my teacher out. Does she like me, do you think? If she doesn't, I'm going to switch courses. I won't work with anyone who doesn't like me."

I feel that I have perhaps laid too much faith in genuine motivation developing out of a real zest, nervous vitality and intuitive perception. Of late I have felt she was doing neither the amount of work nor the thorough work which her capacity and technical understanding warranted. I directly questioned her motivation and told her if she expected to qualify for a diploma it might be best to switch from Music. She immediately faced the statement, which evidently shocked her, and she said she would not give up Singing and needed my help in suggesting contacts. I told her I didn't believe that was true but I would, of course, discuss with her definite projects of her choice—to set her work-pace at a different rate. I believe that our present relationship may make this approach work without affecting her spontaneous pleasure in singing. I don't think any coercion last year would have been wise but perhaps I could have applied it effectively earlier in this term. She certainly has firmly imbedded in her from the secondary boarding school, or elsewhere, the feeling that one works not for pleasure but because of some authoritative dictation.

It is interesting that in spite of my expressed discouragement, Anne's mother feels Anne is far more poised and objective in her judgments. She feels Anne now thinks before she speaks. Anne

said last week, "Mother told me the change in me from my Sarah Lawrence experience was worth a million to her." If this simply meant Anne's acquiescence with her mother's viewpoint, it would worry me, but I feel it means more than that,—how much I don't know yet.

By March in this second year her report from the teacher of her literature course finds her "capable and alert, but erratic. She can handle words well without quite understanding them; she grasps ideas quickly, but does not always think them through. Her work has been good—perhaps as good as she has wanted it to be—but such a head might have done wonders." Between this time and the end of the year she makes efforts to improve her work for all teachers and wins praise for a concert in the voice course. The June reports allude to excellent spots of work, but in spite of the redemption she had achieved, the impression given is one of unevenness and unreliability.

A confidential summary of work in the philosophy course gives this clearly:

Anne's personality as it has appeared in her work with me this year could be charted as a series of clear, repeated, disconnected high spots—with wavering, confused, unchartable and unpredictable behavior in between.

The high spots are: response to persons and materials that are dramatic and colored (in the case of persons, warm personal interest in her way replace dramatic intensity as a basis of response, but in the case of situations or materials no such substitution appears); consistent verbal resistance to authority and assertion of independence but actually complete, unconscious leaning upon authority if it appears in sufficiently personally reassuring or dramatic form; great desire for security appearing both verbally and in behavior; consistent sadism, very thinly disguised, toward her younger sister; in conversation, personal appearance and habits, emphasis on color, fastidiousness, ardent verbal pacifism and gaiety.

Illustrations: Chief enthusiasm in reading for *Thus Spake Zarathustra* and *Man's Fate* (response to poetry and color, not to ideas except to a romanticized independence). As far as I can discover she has no response of her own to other *ideas* in Nietzsche

except as he reinforces her *verbal assertions of independence* and scorn of *weakness*. William James, even the *Letters*, left her completely cold as he is too intellectual, too mellow, and too lacking in intensity.

I think we have done a good enough job with her in so far as we have given her some ease, largely by catering to her emotional demands for always dealing with everything in colorful personal terms. But, though I am glad that she is coming back for a third year, I have grave questions as to whether we should simply continue with more of the same, as she plans, and whether we can do anything for her without striking deeper.

Perhaps the most significant thing in the records is the fact that, up to the end of two years of college, Anne had finished very little written work. What papers there were, were strongly personal, colorful and interesting; they give clear indications of interest, but offer no evidence of sustained work. The committee judging student work found little continuity and less consistent effort toward specific achievement. Yet there was still a fair hope that the girl would come round to a recognition of her need for discipline: her direction had changed. She had discovered through the philosophy course a comparatively absorbing interest—not in further excursions into esoteric realms of metaphysics—but in a very realistic preparation for marriage. She was quite candid about her desire to find the right husband and delightfully unabashed in discussing it with students and faculty. At the beginning of her third year, she has evidently hung up philosophy in the traditional sense; she has put aside a career and is eager to find out about very realistic matters: she decides to take the course in child psychology with units in homemaking and the psychology seminar, to continue with literature (a course in Individual Writers), and to carry work in singing only on a leisure-time basis. Thus, in spite of a comparative disappointment in the development of the student so far, the committee endorsed her return for a third year at least.

Much of her previous history is repeated in the reports for the beginning of this year. In the new subject of child psy-

chology she shows enthusiasm. She takes warmly to the children—her understanding of them is said to be “frequently profound and she has an unusually fine contact with them”—but by the middle of the year there is neither evidence of written work done nor, in the psychology seminar, of her interest in relating actual work with the children to the theoretical reading and discussion. Her singing, on the other hand, has revived; she seems to be doing work more to the point than when she was working for full credit. It is most interesting and somewhat amusing to discover the teacher of literature this year observing precisely the characteristic which the two instructors in music had observed of the student the year before. He reports:

Anne’s thinking, I am suddenly aware, is atomistic; I mean that it is fragmentary, each fragment having a self-consistent, sometimes marvelously complex and interesting organization. But the fragments do not necessarily combine with each other. In fact, I am beginning to suspect that they combine with each other only occasionally, and as the result of sudden shock. But she has great vitality and a realistic, perhaps even profoundly intuitive eye. She does good work with ease, is better at defending points than at expounding them, and is an indispensable member of the class.

The vitality and the intuitive faculty of the girl, perhaps more than any other traits, stimulated her faculty to gather for discussion of her situation during the middle of this third year. Her case was also discussed at some length with one of the experts with whom a group of the faculty were working in educational research. The incident that led most directly toward this meeting of faculty was concerned with a paper for the instructor in the homemaking unit connected with child psychology. What happened is best summarized by a dictated report from the Director of Education:

August 3: Following the failure in Child Psychology (because of lack of time and effort, poor attitude in the Nursery School, superficial reporting), Anne shopped around and finally decided to do some individual work in literature, where the teacher decided to work with her on the basis of very specific assignments

and beginning with simple jobs. On February 22, 1938, a meeting of her faculty was held to discuss her general status and the question of her classification for the coming year. Here there were two groups of opinion: (1) that we must value her intuitive qualities and let her development continue on the basis of what she is and (2) that she be held to very definite jobs and that adequate preparation of assignments be demanded. It was the latter course that was more or less agreed upon. For example, her psychology teacher decided to have her restudy and rewrite a paper which had been very poorly done; her don decided to be very direct with her, and her literature teacher would continue her procedure. Results: A very much better paper was turned in for Child Psychology; the relationship between Anne and the teacher became a far more cordial one, Anne's work in the Nursery School improved markedly so that they are willing to have her go on there on the basis of individual work. In literature all went well until a piece of independent work was assigned which did not result in anything very adequate. Her music teacher's efforts were facilitated by the fact that Anne was preparing for a recital, which she was very keen to give. (It was her own idea; she was taking Voice as leisure time.) The recital showed the girl up extremely well. There were points of forgetting herself and giving herself to her audience through her song in a way that got across very warmly, showing what a real person she could be. On the other hand, her manner, her curtsies, her flitting about, expressed the personality she carries on the outside.

In July she wrote me to ask to have a complete transcript sent to her so that she could find out what credits she could get elsewhere.

Although extreme, this example of erratic and emotional behavior, of the lack of continuity, of dependence upon masters concealed beneath a show of independent vitality and open defiance of authority at certain "safe" moments is so representative of the characteristics of a number of students that it constitutes a type. In each case there appears to be an underlying maladjustment of one sort or another.

In Anne's case her obvious craving for affection, her overemphasis upon the love of the father who had died, indicate a profound feeling of being unwanted. Her eagerness to please in order to win security and affection had developed emo-

tional characteristics which were very winning, but which appeared to defeat her capacity to carry through for long any single relationship. It prevented genuine objective learning.

The effect of these early conditions upon her capacity to learn appears to have been ineradicable. Gifted with sensitiveness, physical vitality and intelligence she nevertheless appeared to have no central core of character. Each experience or cluster of experiences was disparate and unrelated. It does not appear that college reached her merely upon a superficial level, but rather that she felt with equal discrimination about almost any subject or interest with which she came in contact through her personal relation with teachers. Knowledge remained as long as there was immediate emotional justification for it, and vanished when the nature of the relationship to the matter or teacher changed.

Because of this inner tendency of the personality it is an open question whether education of this kind of person in the usual sense can ever take place. While it might be argued that such a character works best under severe authority and regular routinary tasks, it appeared that for Anne such work was possible only when she felt the constant warm, friendly regard of the teacher. It was extremely dubious if she could or would continue for any length of time a mature level of work requiring routine, in a college where most contacts with faculty were impersonal and conventional. In any case, the merely verbal character of her learning would facilitate cramming and passing exams, but would give her no more real preparation for living or for a vocation than she received under the progressive curriculum. Perhaps the one thing she got from her experience in this college up to the middle of the third year was an increasing sense of ease and well being in relationship with people on campus; but there is evidence that she had not greatly improved the stability of her contacts with men or girls of her own age. Moreover whatever "ease" she may have felt in this environment was sufficiently shat-

tered by the final attempt to make her face the situation. It can scarcely be doubted that this attempt to bring her to a recognition of realities mainly contributed to her decision to continue her work the next year at a new institution. Putting it briefly, she had exhausted the possibilities of the Sarah Lawrence curriculum for change and "new leases on life."

The likelihood that specific, inexorable, regular requirements did have an important value for Anne is suggested by the fact that she went to an excellent large University and received her A.B. degree there. In subsequent letters to former teachers at Sarah Lawrence, she wrote of continual strain with her mother. She has now married. [Postscript by L.B.M.]

Summary

The sketch of Anne is the story of one of the originally "scattered" students who were so challenging and so difficult to educate that faculty wished to make a special effort to understand their methods of working. Sarah Lawrence teachers never felt satisfied with Anne's development in this college despite their respect for her flashes of intuitive brilliance, but she completed an A.B. at a university of outstanding reputation. This suggests that students of this sort, who are so driven by forces from within that in a free situation they cannot organize their energy toward an integrated result, belong in colleges where the pressure from outside in the form of rigid requirements gives the external framework which the girl needs. Like many other scattered students, Anne appears to be very dependent upon an intensely personal rapport with teacher and materials; but this may be simply another expression of her great dependence upon external relationships to provide the pattern of her work.

TEST RECORD FOR ANNE

PRE-COLLEGE RECORD

Name of Test

	<i>Score</i>	<i>IQ</i>
American Council Psychological	172	Class Average 191.7

COLLEGE RECORD

American Council on Education

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
Completion	80	Analogies	90
Arithmetic	19	Opposites	90
Artificial Language	32	Gross Score	64

Bernreuter Personality Inventory

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
B1-N	62	B4-D	44
B2-S	99	F1-C	36
B3-I	58	F2-S	99+

Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Women

Nurse	B+	Lawyer	C
Housewife	B+	Physician	C+
Social Worker	B-	Librarian	B-
Secretary-Stenographer	B-	Artist	B+
Teacher in General	C	Author	B+

A CORRECTION TO DETERMINISTIC THINKING: VIRGINIA

ASIDE FROM her excellent mind, Virginia seemed to have little basis for success when she came to Sarah Lawrence. Her background was one of a lonely and unhappy childhood and of family conflict and illness, to which she was most sensitive. She had charge, in effect, of her family affairs, felt the burden and strain of mother, father, younger sister. There is also a record of sickness in her own history, and of spiritual conflict, together with an inability to complete her first year at a major Eastern college because of trouble with her eyesight. Moreover, she had disliked the other college and entered Sarah Lawrence with a strong suspicion she would dislike any college. Her first year was difficult; there were moments when she was almost on the edge of leaving. The family strain grew increasingly heavy and came to a crisis in her second year, with her mother's death and the dissolution of her home.

Her interests were clear, however, and her freshman program included dramatics, literature, and American history. In the first half year she had already made a good preliminary impression on her instructors:

DRAMATICS (Nov. 8).—The student has a very good critical mind, very good powers of analysis, and a mature approach. She is eager to learn about the theatre and her comprehension of it is growing. She has basic equipment upon which to build techniques, and the ability and intelligence to acquire them. She has definite reasons for working in this field and will be able to use what she learns. She is more interested in production as a whole than in just learning to act.

LITERATURE AND ENVIRONMENT (Nov. 8).—An unusual student—very able intellect, very sensitive emotions, and well motivated. Satisfactory placement; although she has too much work to do—so far with no bad results, but has to be watched in terms of fatigue and adjustment. One of the best members of the group.

Virginia is one of the very small group of students who are pure pleasure. She has a wider range of genuine interests—from aesthetic theory to economic problems. She is alert, does not accept blindly, asks almost every time *the* important question and does not waste time talking about nothing.

DRAMATICS (Jan. 15).—She has made excellent use of her time and opportunities, and her understanding of theatrical materials and her comprehension of what the theatre means have steadily increased. In managing the properties for "Trelawny of the Wells" she showed that she had already established for herself methods of analysis and organization, and the resourcefulness, independence, responsibility and care for details with which she carried on that work helped materially in putting on the play. Since she has developed this careful, meticulous approach to material it would be wise now, I think, to concentrate on acquiring freedom of response, relaxation, and a more facile use of her imaginative powers.

I am sorry that she was prevented by illness from taking part in the Christmas play, as working on it would have been a step toward establishing these things. Her class work was a good beginning toward acquiring definite techniques in acting.

AMERICAN CULTURE AND HISTORY.—Class work and conference discussion show good understanding of material. I am waiting for the next written papers for evidence on the ability to present material in this form. Very good at seeing the crucial point and raising the relevant issues.

A combination of eye trouble and dramatics have prevented Virginia from doing much work during the past weeks. The former did more than slow down her reading in that it shook her confidence in her ability to carry on her work. Her confidence is apparently now restored and she should go ahead well, although still a little handicapped by having to go easy on reading. She has a fertile and inquiring mind and strong sympathy and should be in a position to satisfy her inquiries and substantiate her feelings through wide and relatively undirected (by anyone else) reading. The problem of her eyes has to be met by selecting and advising a minimum of reading. This is not altogether satisfactory but is the best that can be done in the circumstances. I am trying to arrange field work for her wherever possible to provide a supplement.

There had been a period of great stress during this first half year, with fatigue and overwork. Her eye trouble re-

turned; we did not know how much of this might be psychological and due to insecurity and fear and worry. She had to cut down her work; she felt that there was not much use in trying to carry a college program. She was prevented by illness from taking part in the Christmas play, as her dramatics instructor recorded. "Since the last report," her literature teacher notes, "she has given evidence of another side of her temperament; emotional intensity amounting at times to despair, impatience and petulance. . . . Temper and a general romanticism that is just as strong as her realism and maturity." This was certainly an understatement, commented her literature instructor, for at that period he was afraid she might leave college at any moment.

By March, the tension was somewhat relieved. The don notes less fatigue. Another real change the student felt in herself has been the passing of a "sophomoric melancholia." She still has moods but there are definite reasons for them. The don's report is an excellent summary of the period so far:

This student is a complete liberal by temperament. She is naturally inquiring, intellectually able, conscientious, responsible and has the kind of self-respect that insists on the highest standards for herself.

Her program has worked out very satisfactorily.

Beginning with the reading of "Germinal" in her Literature course, an experience which stirred her profoundly, she has gradually acquired through the year an intense interest in what she calls the social movement and a real desire to know more about it. Chiefly because of her teacher in Literature, she has grown interested in writing and hopes to do more of it.

It would be inaccurate to attribute any part of her development, however, to any one of her subjects for she naturally correlates them all in her own mind, just as she easily and without effort finds them related to her own experiences.

Her work in history has led her into philosophical analyses of her perception of time and the continuing phenomena of human behavior through many different times—perhaps a by-product but an interesting one.

She has found the field trips she has taken very stimulating and

has never been afraid of doing more work than absolutely necessary.

The problem of fatigue has worked itself out. The student is not strong physically but seems to be growing better and except for some eye trouble which interfered with her work, but not seriously, for a short time, and an illness just before Christmas vacation, she has managed her health problem so that it has had a minimum effect on her life. She insists that she is not overworking nor over-straining in any way and that she is growing stronger all the time. Walking is the only exercise that she can take, however, so, of course, her interest in sports is limited.

Even without being in the best of health and with doing very good work in all of her subjects, she found time to be a delegate from here to the Vassar League of Nations Assembly, a project which took strenuous preparation.

I believe she feels socially secure. She is attractive, very neat, and comfortable in class and conference. She goes to dances and proms with various men, and has a group of friends here. She was troubled at the beginning of the year because of her "microscopic" interest in people. She said she felt cold-blooded and aloof from them. She feels that this has changed, that she is much more a participant now than observer and that she has real friends.

When she came here she said she was fed-up with college (she had had a year two years before) and had come as a convenient way to pass the year. She grew interested almost immediately, has grown more enthusiastic throughout the year and hopes to return for the next two years.

It worries her that she doesn't see her career in clear terms—that she doesn't know what she wants to do. At first she felt she wanted to work with little children either in the theatre or in social work or in both, but now she is so eager for financial independence she wants any job she can get. She does not have to be worried about supporting herself nor is she suffering for lack of money now (she keeps well within her allowance) but she hates her dependence on her family and feels strongly that she must be free from its erratic domination.

It seemed to her adviser that if there was some typical sophomore melancholia, her depression involved much more than this. There was within Virginia a good deal of psychic maladjustment in terms of her own life, and this accentuated her reactions to the tragedy of her home life. Yet she pulled

herself through all this. And by June her progress was confirmed by fine work in all fields. "In spite of a very bad home situation," her history instructor says, "Virginia has kept at her work with lively interest and energy." "She has fulfilled her earlier promise," her literature teacher says, and the dramatics teacher's report indicates real growth in many respects:

The student's sensitivity to her own experiences has increased materially, as has her awareness of the elements in them which form the materials of the theatre and the bases of understanding human activity. She is developing her sensory perceptions and establishing the habit of close observation and constant analysis. Her understanding of the theatre, in its relation to a reflection of the present cultural pattern, is increasing, too, as is her actual knowledge of the techniques which serve it.

She has the ability to define problems and shows initiative and independence in solving them.

Her acting is improving. She has grown freer in her approach and is gaining flexibility and conscious control of her own concentrations. The Commercial Artist in "Your Deal, Sarah" was a complete and consistent person. The student should work now to develop vitality and to improve her voice and speech.

She is an extremely cooperative member of the Activity.

Résumé of First Year

Well, what is the answer? This student, with a dubious record of past training and environment, with unusual family stress, with poor physical health, weak eyes, psychological maladjustment, comes to college as a convenient way to pass a year and ends with a total "success story" it would be difficult to equal. It is so easy to trace causes of failure, at least after the fact, but can we find definite causes of this progress?

Are the answers to be found in: The general educational set-up of this college, as against a formal institution? The chance that she began her work with three instructors in whose field she became interested, and who were generally sympathetic toward her? The possibility that she herself worked through her crisis and previous failures and had de-

cided to adjust herself—that this progress would have come in any institution or job? But these are unsatisfactory. Where did we use specific educational techniques which happened to click, and what were they? What are the more basic psychological truths implied by her progress? Does she tend to negate a deterministic view that early environment produces the personality structure?

Virginia is an example of the person who should be—who has every warrant to be—highly maladjusted, and is not. Or, to put it more precisely, she is a person with a background that usually precedes maladjustment, who has managed by herself to make a satisfactory adjustment.

The conclusions from this seem to be: 1) that there are facts about her environment (and about her) that negate the facts we know; 2) that unfortunate family patterns produce very good results, as well as the reverse; 3) that certain personalities can break through the forces that would bind the ordinary person, and use such forces for the good. And many more than these.

I have not meant, in the glow of pleasure at an unusually good student, to imply that Virginia is without strain or stress, without her sensitivities and low moments; or, that unfortunate background events, while they have added to her maturity and appreciation of experience, have not also weakened her. But the total picture of her personality, her achievement, her development and promise—this against her background—merits praise.

Let us leave these questions for a moment and see what happens to her in the following year. For this year she did not return to college; her domineering father disapproved of spending her time here. To be sure, she had had some moments of wanting to leave during the year; she had run away from home as a child, just packed herself off; and I used to speculate whether some Friday afternoon she would not repeat this pattern at the college. As an alumna she felt that her father's disapproval and her mother's need were the chief

factors in leaving. Her mother had grown sicker; it was advised she leave her home and come to New York, and Virginia went along with her. Was this necessary? Virginia could have lived in New York and come to the college. There is, however, the fact that it was necessary for her to be with her mother steadily. Her mother died this year. Apparently under this strain she simply could not return to college. She went instead to a very good business school to prepare herself for a job, so that she could make herself economically independent and also carry on a type of study that would avoid her father's criticism. She took, for an intellectual, prosaic and routine enough courses, which may have been very smart of her. The transcript of her record showed that with the exception of "Filing and Indexing" (C-) and "Management Problems" (C+) her grades were B to A- in the various specific courses involved in secretarial training.

After her mother's death her father's attitude toward college became favorable. She returned the following year, and her November reports indicate she came back with the same traits or with better ones than those with which she left. She continued to do well in dramatics and writing, and in a new field, psychology.

And to make her story short, the rest of the year is highly successful. What then did she do with this program? She made a study, in dramatics, of the Federal Children's Theatre, wrote on her experiences in her work in a writing course, and related her work in psychology to this by studying children. If we ask correlation of courses, or ask that knowledge should not be in separate watertight categories, if we ask that the student's academic work be related to her chief interests, this is not a bad example. Moreover, Virginia dramatized a children's book and helped produce a play at the college for an audience of school children. She worked with a group of children in dramatics at a near-by elementary school. She observed various groups, such as those of Moreno at Beacon and Bender at Bellevue Hospital, which were

using dramatic art as psychological therapy, worked along with them part of the time. In reading and writing, she became interested in Proust and had regular conferences with the instructor in the French literature department. "She has read Proust completely," this instructor noted. "Her discussions show that her reading was a very intelligent and very thorough job." I quote now her January and April reports of her second year at this college.

CREATIVE AND CRITICAL WRITING. (Jan. 31).—Continued fine work. I'd like to see her now: 1) finish her present project; 2) make a study of Proust, working with the instructor in the French literature department; 3) do quite a few short reviews of books in general; 4) do some short stories. This may sound like a bit of a load but she is used to loads.

PSYCHOLOGY SEMINAR.—Virginia's work is consistently competent and mature, and indicates that she is ready for professional training.

I expect that her present project of work with a group of seven-year-olds in dramatics will give greater scope for her analytic and creative abilities than anything she has done so far. She has developed excellent rapport with the children and has succeeded in helping them carry through their own ideas to their great delight and satisfaction. Virginia has shown a very broad approach in her observations of them, with awareness of both the emotional values of different kinds of material and the social relations among the children.

DRAMATICS.—This student has made a good start toward her study of Children's Theatres in America.

In managing the costumes for the last play, she showed again that she is responsible, efficient, industrious and conscientious and is capable of doing independent work of high quality.

She is adapting material for a children's play but this work cannot be evaluated until it is finished.

DRAMATICS.—Recent writing for a children's play shows that the student has learned a great deal about play making. She tells a story in clearer terms, is more sensitive to the quality of her characters, and has developed a regard for their integrity. She is becoming more aware of the importance of the relationship of the emotional content of each scene to the whole but needs practice in building sequences to secure emotional climaxes. Since the play isn't finished—the student has covered

ground very slowly—it can't be evaluated now but it looks as though it were going to be a good piece of work.

READING AND WRITING.—Excellent student, excellent work. This student's discussion shows that she is getting a great deal from her reading of Proust. She shows an active, perceptive mind which lets nothing go by unnoticed, to which every detail is significant. She has an intellectual good will to understand and appreciate ideas and feeling in a different tradition, or in one which she dislikes personally. She takes a pleasing and unusual initiative in conference.

PSYCHOLOGY SEMINAR.—Virginia has been making a study of children's dramatics on the basis of: 1) carrying on a dramatics group of seven-year-old children; 2) observing the use of dramatics in therapeutic work at Bellevue hospital, Moreno's spontaneity theatre at Beacon, etc.; 3) reading in psychological journals. This is providing background for a final summary paper in which she will relate her study to children's dramatics. Her approach has been integrated at a mature level, showing fine understanding and ability to relate scientific concepts to her own observations.

It would seem that she used her program, despite its seeming narrowness, pretty well. She used it at once to integrate and relate, and as a springboard for other educational projects, both in the "real world" of outside jobs and in the intellectual world. It is true that this objective record of success does not represent the entire picture; and there were moments this year also of despair and a sense of frustration; again at times she wanted to quit, to get out into real life, to do more, be independent. But the difficulties have become less severe now. If she is maladjusted, she has adjusted herself quite well to it. And in June she gives a fairly cheerful picture. "Virginia summarized her work of the year . . . in a paper on Children's Dramatics which will be a valuable contribution to our child psychology library," her psychology instructor says. "She is a remarkably acute observer of ideas, character and style," the instructor in the French literature department says. "The student has made exceptionally good use of the opportunities offered by the college to build a substantial program," the dramatics teacher says. "The best

student I have worked with this year, and perhaps for quite a few years. I say this carefully, with due deliberation, and firmly, with conviction," her reading and writing instructor says.

What is the answer? It is very sad still to confess that I don't know. It would be nice to raise this question, as I have steadily, and then answer it firmly and intelligently at the end of this case study. It is too bad that I can't. I do not know, and I don't wish to pretend that I do. Below, I have sketched out some lines which might be fruitful to follow up in any future study of this material, together with a few tentative opinions of mine.

First, let us catch up the threads already pulled out. Of these, the psychological issues are probably the more basic; all the rest depend somewhat on them. Are there facts about Virginia's childhood environment which contradict those we know? From these facts, the picture seems about as bad as it can be—family stress, the rather terrible routine crimes committed twenty years ago against all children as a matter of course, and a continuing record of conflict within herself and increasing family insecurity. I should like to add more details which support this view, but cannot. And in spite of this, Virginia developed a personality structure that, though the superstructure swayed at times, was firm enough. I have mentioned, before, the need for our developing some educational or psychological techniques which help us place maladjusted students. Psychiatry would be of great educational use here if we could learn from it to distinguish between those emotionally pressed students who can profit by education and those who cannot, and could learn to do so before and not after the efforts of four years of teaching. Virginia's case seems to qualify this statement in some degree, in so far as it teaches us caution in making easy judgments, or in refusing to attempt the education of apparently maladjusted students. One such success as this indeed is probably worth two or three failures.

What we liked chiefly about Virginia was her independence, responsibility, and reliability. Where did these come from? Partly, I believe, from her home environment, which, while it may have weakened her in some respects and may have drawn her spiritual tension too tight, also aided her. From having to take care of the family management in a large degree while she was young, she developed skills that were carried over to her academic work. Again, and with some irony, from wishing to get away from this background, to be on her own and free, she early began to take outside jobs. In the year she was away from college, during the summer vacations and during the college year itself, she was generally busy at work outside of academic areas—handling jobs and people, running things, developing the traits necessary for successful, practical accomplishment after college. These traits we often fail to give our students in purely academic training. We should perhaps try harder to implant them, in order to make the transition from college to the outside world a little easier.

It was the work Virginia did beyond academic limits which in part made her so successful. We should, I think, encourage such work—vacation jobs, outside work during college—for these will save us much time in getting to our goal of practical virtue. We should look upon it as being part of our academic program, as being also a training. I myself would like to see us broaden the range of our college training. At Sarah Lawrence we have successfully integrated the arts, music, painting, writing, and so on, with our “academic” work; we no longer look upon a degree in composing music, let us say, as a triviality or an eccentricity. We should work further to integrate outside experience, too, as part of our college course. It seems to me true that students who have worked a year or so between high school and college get much more from college. The extra year of age puts Time on our side, the training in experiential virtues of practicality clears the road for richer academic content.

It would seem from all this that Virginia's background, in giving her a sense of insecurity, in making her take over responsibility too early, and even in making her wish to get away from it, also contributed to her development. This is rare, I know, and more often it turns out the other way. Our students sometimes display insecurity in less favorable forms: in complacency; in a defensive compensation of arrogance; perfectionism; what we used to call "laziness"—these are more common forms. Again some typical products of American leisure-class culture are afflicted with a double disease. Ignorant or callous early education leads to a deeper inner insecurity, while excess affection of the parents gives a veneer of precious, luxurious, and extravagant individualism—a spoiled-baby insecurity. More affection in the right instances and less in the wrong would sometimes help, though I say this realizing how difficult it is to bring up children with the best of knowledge and intentions, and knowing there must always be a margin of error, it is also true that many of our typical children are nothing *but* margins of error. College spends four years trying to correct, too late, traits of temperament which should never have been formed. But Virginia indicates that insecurity may be good, if the student works out a constructive answer to it. And insecurity, of course, has led to many—or most—of our achievements in personal terms. Some would say indeed that all we have accomplished as a race has been due to this; that our history is nothing more than an attempt to feel more at home in the world than we do. One of our jobs educationally is to know how to use insecurity, how to show our students the ways of harnessing it to fruitful accomplishment.

Summary

The attention of teachers is inevitably drawn to students who are baffling—who, like Madeleine and Hortense, work without showing the growth in personality their teachers believe they need—or who, like Anne, do not even appear to

work consecutively, despite their good intentions and their ability. Thus the "best" records of students for the case summaries were records of those who presented more or less serious problems of intellectual or personality development. We have already pointed out repeatedly that even serious problems of adjustment may stimulate learning and growth. But the cumulative weight of the studies just presented may seem to negate this. Virginia's story is offered as evidence for this contention. In a nutshell, we may say that the effort she made to prepare herself for economic independence despite a background of wealth was reinforced, if not initially stimulated, by insupportable family strains; through the active effort to solve her problems she transcended them.

Virginia herself, five years out of college, has read this report and comments that her teachers might have helped her more than they did. They were too easily fooled by an appearance of social security that was merely her cover for great insecurity with other girls. They might have urged her to enter more extracurricular and community activities. Her need for this, in spite of her appearance of success, might have been discovered, she suggests, by a Rorschach or other psychiatric test. Success in academic areas meant little to her—she had had prizes all her life; better social relations were what she longed for, although she did her best to hide her feeling of inadequacy in this area.

These comments are important, I think, to remind us that even gallant personalities like Virginia may have a deep need for the most searching diagnosis and understanding that a college can offer.

TEST RECORD FOR VIRGINIA

PRE-COLLEGE RECORD

(No information)

COLLEGE RECORD

American Council on Education

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
Completion	96	Analogies	66
Arithmetic	56	Opposites	95
Artificial Language	97	Gross Score	96

Bernreuter Personality Inventory

	<i>Percentile</i>		<i>Percentile</i>
B1-N	14	B4-D	93
B2-S	90	F1-C	3
B3-1	15	F2-S	82

INDEX

- Academic work, integration of arts with, 390
- Achievement, alone not enough, 125; versus development: Madeleine, 313-30
- Active student, motor development, 159
- Activities, subsequent, of Sarah Lawrence students, 13; attitudes concerned with role played by, 159
- Activity, relating oneself to world of thought and, 158-60
- Adjustment, of insecure group, 138; over-all superiority of Sarah Lawrence girls in, 139; illness may be symptom of problems of, 157; even serious problems of, may stimulate learning and growth, e.g., Virginia, 392
- Admission application, study of interests as expressed in, 38 ff.
- Admissions Committee, 211
- Adolescents, Study of, 139
- Adviser's role, 22; active and passive approaches of, 25-26; reassurance to student, 25 ff.
- Aggressive attitudes, 179, 187; conflict about, 30; effect of exposure to materials dealing with, 84; annoy fellow students, 151
- Allport-Vernon Values Study: Hortense, 205; Louise, 211, 242; Priscilla, 301
- Ambitious student, 174-205
- Ambivalence, resulting from early shock, 206 ff.; toward authority, 216, 234, 235, 376
- American Council on Education Examination, place of superficial students in, 133; of the insecure, 142
- Test Scores, 90, 91, 106, 119, 171; place of students who fit into faculty expectation and those who present mild disappointments, 129; Hortense, 205; Louise, 211, 242; Fern, 273; Priscilla, 301; Marian, 312; Madeleine, 330; Julia, 338; Judith, 355; Patsy, 366; Anne, 379; Virginia, 393
- Anne, need for being liked by teacher, 173, 370, 372, 377, 379; a "scattered" student, 367-79; programs, 367, 368, 371, 374; characteristics, 367, 370, 372 ff.; family relationships, 369, 371, 372, 378; social life, 369; sudden shock of father's death, 369, 375, 376; intuitive qualities, 369, 370, 375, 376, 378; inability to hold friendships of men and girls of own age, 370, 377; insecurity in personal relationships, 370, 372, 376; attitude toward authority, 372, 376; teachers' reports, 372, 375 f.; unevenness and unreliability, 373; tendency toward verbal expression, 373, 374, 377; emphasis on color, 373, 374; confidential summary of work in social philosophy, 373; absorbing interest in marriage, 374; effect of early conditions upon capacity to learn, 377; increasing sense of ease in personal relationships, 377; received A.B. in another university, 378; test record, 379; a baffling student, 391
- Antagonism to authority, 130, 146, 191; *see also* Authority; Hostility
- Anthropology, 157
- Anxiety, 305, 320, 321; scatter rooted in, 27, 105; passivity a defense against, 84; about social life, 106; in form of nervousness or neuroticism, 114 f.; excessive preoccupation with detail, 119; expressed in vagueness, 120; a major factor in disorganized work habits, 143; worrying attitudes toward work, 163; *see also* Insecurity
- Arts, students' interest in, 38 ff.; shock-reaction as phase of orientation, 76; integration of, with academic work, 390

- Attitudes, varieties of learning, 62-75; toward coming to college, 64-69; toward teaching and being taught, 69-73; teacher-student rapport, 73-74; broadening and reshaping of values and, 76; aggressive, 84, 151, 179, 187; identifying, 146; oneself in relation to other people, 160-61; worrying, toward work, 163; *see also* Authority, problems of; Hostility
- Authority, dependence on, 130, 145-55; antagonism to, 130, 146, 191; problems of, in relation to learning, 145-56; identifying attitudes, 146; dependence focused on home, 147; hypothesis re basis of a common pattern of response to, 149; tendency to take opinion of a man as final, 149, 151; indiscriminating attribution of, to printed word, 150; those whose thinking appears relatively free from, 151; assumption of, 151; of mother, 153; different attitudes require different handling, 155; response to world of reality and, 161-62; no one pattern good for all, 162; ambivalent attitude toward, 216, 234, 235, 376
- Autobiographies, students', 68
- Background, educational, 77, 80; cultural, 80; influence of underprivileged and privileged homes, 160
- Baffling students, 391
- Bernreuter Personality Inventory ratings: Hortense, 205; Louise, 211, 242; Fern, 273; Priscilla, 301; Marian, 312, Madeleine, 330; Julia, 338; Judith, 355; Patsy, 366; Anne, 379; Virginia, 393
- Bernreuter Test, 138
- Binet Test, 120
- Biology, information through units associated with psychology courses and marriage unit, 40*n*; laboratory work in, 122
- Blue slips, records of, 106
- "Boy-crazy" girls, 107
- Boy-girl relations, 107 ff.
- Burgemeister, B. B., 58
- Campus, adjustment to, 109; source of strain on, 110
- Campus, The*, 109
- Case studies, 139, 148 f., 167-393; use of records for, 169; best records for summaries, 392
- Casualness, 129
- Character, basic, 157; *see also* Personality
- Children, patterns of behavior and learning, 8; studies of overprotected, 56; sequences of latency and blossoming in pre-school, 82; result of anxiety, 120; psychology students who are afraid of, 121; orientations characteristic of, almost from early months, 159; important factors in determining response to authority, 161; only child situation, 260
- Clowning, 213, 214, 231, 243
- College, attitudes toward coming to, 64-69; failure to prepare women for family responsibilities, 57; girls who left, contrasted with those who stayed, 90; merely part of total life situation, 100; frequency of leaving, 107; what education involves, 117
- College activities, responsibility for, 109; freshman participation in, 110
- College records, 84, 169, 392
- Colorlessness, 141
- Concentration, *see* Specialization
- Conflicts, between emphasis on growth and upon achievement, 30; responses to, 46; conflicting interests, 126; in records of spasmodically creative girls, 132; with previous standards, 141; caused by divided state of emotional life, 216, 234
- Constraint and overconscientiousness, *see* Overconscientiousness
- Courses, flexible organization of, 30
- Creative work, 132
- Criticism, interpreting need for, 46; defensive attitude toward, 186, 191; a threat to ego, 324, 325
- Curriculum, new experiments, 5; selection of materials in, dependent upon readiness of student, 6; ques-

- tions regarding guidance, 19-22;
 courses that have release value, 29;
 courses handled from a guidance
 point of view, 30; shift to a diag-
 nostic basis for planning, 35; in-
 terests expressed on Form A and
 curriculum which students fol-
 lowed, 38 ff. *tabs.*; expressive func-
 tions of, 50-53; pressures that
 influence program-choices, 55; ex-
 ploratory courses, 96; sequences,
 98; point extremely important in
 planning for individual students,
 204; therapeutic uses of, 356-79;
 flexible program planning, 356 ff.,
 367
- Defiance, *see* Hostility
- Definiteness, need for and rebellion
 against, 125
- Dependence on authority, 145-55;
 on interest of teachers, 186, 262,
 266; unsatisfied attitude of, result-
 ing from traumatic shock, 217
- Detail, excessive preoccupation with,
 119
- Development, of personality, 10, 100;
 patterns of, 84; ways in which it
 comes, 90-103; general basis of,
 from college point of view, 91;
 self-understanding basic to other
 aspects of, 92; from students' point
 of view, 92 f.; check-up of intel-
 lectual and personality, 100; stu-
 dents who develop steadily, 128-
 30; ideal, 152; contributions to new
 understanding of, 157; achieve-
 ment versus, Madeleine, 313-30;
 of skill, 330-38
- Diagnosis, role of, in educational
 guidance, 10-33; making use of
 diagnostic data, 16-19; curricular
 guidance, 19-22; adviser's role,
 22-29; teaching as guidance, 29-
 31; use of the psychiatrist, 31-32;
 Student Work Committee, 32-33
- Dick, Lillian, study of interests of
 incoming students as expressed in
 application for admission, 38 ff.
- Dictatorial attitude, 181, 188
- Differences, individual, 70; planning
 college work in relation to, 3
- Direction, need for, 162
- Director of Education, 91
- Discussion group, 161
- Dissection, emotional problems
 opened up by, 122
- Docility, *see* Passivity
- Domination, by family, 154; *see*
also Family relationships; Father;
 Mother
- Dons, responsibilities: records, 111
- Dramatic art as psychological ther-
 apy, 387
- "Drinking-in" student, *see* Recep-
 tive student
- Drive, lack of, 129
- Dynamic factors in learning, 157-65;
 relating oneself to world of activ-
 ity and thought, 158-60; oneself
 in relation to others, 160-61; re-
 sponse to world of reality and au-
 thority, 161-62; dealing with prob-
 lems, 162-65
- Educability, 237
- Education, individual, and social
 change, 3-9; feminizing of, to neg-
 lect of science, 56
- Educational point of view, devel-
 opment of, 1-165
- Emotional factors, in learning, 6, 9;
 tensions, 113, 206; adequacy af-
 fected by, 131; *see also* Conflicts;
 Family relationships; Tensions
- Emotion and the Educative Process*,
 157
- Energy, case of extreme, 210, 211
- Examinations, attitude toward, 158
- Experience, human: records of, il-
 luminate problems of present, 6
- Exploratory courses develop family
 or club atmosphere, 110
- Faculty, *see* Teachers
- Family relationships: tensions, 30, 85,
 105, 171, 178, 212; parent-identi-
 fications, 83; attitudes affected by,
 104; effect of war upon, 115; dom-
 ination by family, 154; sibling ten-
 sions, 212, 339-55
- Family responsibilities, failure of col-
 lege to prepare women for, 57
- Father, as authority, 150; tension be-

- Father (*Continued*)
 tween student and, 212, 213; domineering, 385
- Fear, by no means leads to failure, 142; cleverly masked, difficult to handle, 142; elemental reactions, 143; of what others would think, 246, 247; *see also* Insecurity
- Feeling, unity of thought and, 164
- Fern, practical, limited ability, 171-72, 244-73; characteristics, 244 ff., 254, 256 ff.; programs, 244, 257, 259, 267; social life, 245, 252, 254; relations with other girls, 245 f., 256, 266, 272; feeling of social inferiority, 245 ff.; first year record, 247 ff.; advisability of return to college questioned, 253; relations with faculty, 256, 266, 272; determination to make grade: disturbed at not being classified, 256; growing independence and self-respect, 257, 258, 262, 263, 264, 269; moral triumph, 258; dependence on interest of teachers, 262, 266; change in attitudes, 264, 266, 267, 271; attitude toward parents, 266, 267, 272; toward boy friend, 267; increasing self-knowledge, 272; test record, 273
- Field work, field trip shock, 76; attitude toward teacher influenced by trips, 110; difficulties in, 121-23; affected by unconscious attitudes, 161
- Flexibility, need for, 47
- Formality, 125
- Freedom, limited value of, 126; need for, 162
- Freeman, F. N., 82
- Friendships, campus adjustment, 109; *see also* Social life
- Fromm, Erich, 146
- Frustration, 130
- General Education Board, 169
- Gestalt approach to personality, 157
- Group activities, 109; freshman participation in, 110
- Growth, 7; stages in orientation and, 76-89; immaturity and differing rates of, 80-82; rhythms of, 82-88; summary of dynamic principles, 157 ff.; *see also* Development
- Growth spurts, 80; and periods of latency, 82
- Guidance, educational: role of diagnosis in, 10-33; making use of diagnostic data, 16-19; curricular guidance, 19-22; adviser's role, 22-29; teaching as, 29-31; use of the psychiatrist, 31-32; Student Work Committee, 32-33; implications for, 59, 74-75, 89, 103, 115-16, 126-27, 136, 143-44, 155-56
- Health, 85, 112-15; most common complaints, 112; infirmity contacts, 112, 114
- Heterosexual adjustment, effect of war upon, 115
- Heterosexual interest, 81
- Hitler, Adolf, 36
- Home influence, underprivileged and privileged backgrounds, 160; *see also* Family relationships
- Hortense, limited ability, 171-73; ambition, narrow talent, rigidity, 174-205; behavior and attitudes, 174, 177, 202; background, 174; programs, 175, 177, 182, 193; achievement and capacity rate, 176; family tensions, 178, 184, 185; characteristics, 179, 187 ff.; prejudices, 179, 192, 200; talents, 181 ff. *passim*; report on, 183; teacher's fear that her development may come to standstill, 183, 185, 189; limited social life, 185, 186, 191; dependence upon interest of teachers, 186; changes in attitudes, 190; academic reports, 193 ff.; development, 195, 200; test record, 205; a baffling student, 391
- Hostility, passivity as a defense against, 84; to teachers a reflection of attitude toward adults at home, 105; to college authorities, 130; by no means leads to failure, 142; repressed or masked, 145; resistance to new ideas, 147; to conventional authority, 191
- Human values, lack of interest in, 123

- Ideas, universalization of, 4; resistance to new, 147
- Identifying attitudes, 146; *see also* Attitudes
- Immaturity, and differing rates of growth, 80-82; factors responsible for, 81
- Inadequacy, feelings of, *see* Inferiority, feelings of
- Indecisiveness, 163
- Individualism and emotional freedom, 5 f.
- Individualization of education, 3-9
- Individual studies, 167-393; Introduction, 169-73; case summaries, 174-393
- Inferiority, feelings of, 209, 216, 220, 246, 247, 302, 347, 350; how they may be relieved, 144; feelings of inadequacy expressed or compensated for, 172; *see also* Insecurity
- Infirmity, number of visits to: most common complaints, 112; students with largest number of contacts, 114
- Inhibited girls, *see* Insecurity
- Insecurity, 137-44; expressed in vagueness, 120; a temporary characteristic of many students, 137; desirable to evaluate extent to which it hampers effective dealing with problems, 138; individual instances, 139; clinging to family values as a defense against, 141; by no means leads to failure, 142, 143; less dangerous to intellectual work than rigidity or superficiality, 143; ways of displaying, 391; *see also* Anxiety; Fear; Hostility; Inferiority, feelings of; Shyness
- Intellect, different rates and patterns of development, 80 ff.; check-up of development, 100; effort to develop an integrated ability to reason, 164; limited general intelligence plus artistic gifts, Hortense, 174-205; *see also* Thought and thinking
- Interest, relation to ability to learn, 62
- Interests, 7; and motivation, 34-61; reevaluation of meaning, 34; abilities do not always determine, 35-36; where do they come from? 36-42; of incoming students as expressed in application for admission, 38 ff.; students' reports on development of, 42-45; changes in emphasis between freshman and senior year, 42; awakening of new, 43; needs that shape, 45-50; expressive functions of curricular areas, 50-53; interest areas in relation to personality patterns, 53-58; instability of, 58-59; compulsive, 59; conflicting, 126; shifting, 209
- Intuition, in creative work, 132
- Judith, sibling rivalry, 339-55; background, 339; characteristics, 339 ff.; feeling of superiority, 339, 341, 344; intellectual assurance and curiosity, 340, 342, 346, 347, 349; interests, 340, 343-46; social life, 341, 346, 347; criticism of teacher's method, 342; interest in Bryn Mawr, 343, 347, 353; program, 345; academic and emotional needs, 346; hypotheses, 346 ff.; sense of racial and social inferiority, 347, 350; ideals, 351; need to study human conduct, 352; a completely integrated character, 353; college experience a defense or proof of her ability: test record, 355; security in heterosexual relationships provided by college, 355
- Julia, "development" as development of skill, 330-38; background: family, 330, 333; programs, 331, 333, 334; campus and social life, 331, 336, 337; characteristics, 331 ff.; operating procedures resented by students, 336; why she did not tackle her problems, 337; narrowness of experience: married life: test record, 338
- Kafka, Franz, 198
- Laboratory observation, difficulties in, 121-23

- Ladd, Henry, case studies, 169 ff.
 Language, students' interest in, 38 ff.
 Latency, periods of, and growth spurts, 82
 Learning, teachers' conception of integrated, 90; authority problems in relation to, 145-56 (*see also* Authority); dynamic factors, 157-65
 Learning attitudes, varieties of, 62-75; toward coming to college, 64-69; toward teaching and being taught, 69-73; teacher-student rapport, 73-74; implications for guidance, 74-75
 Leaves, frequency of, 107
 Lectures, program composed of, neglects natural media of active students, 159; difficulty in appreciating, 277, 332
 Letters, importance of, 108
 Levy, David, studies of overprotected children, 56
 Life histories, summaries of a group of, 174-393
 Liss, 83
 Literature, students' interest in, 38 ff.; as aid to normal thinking, 105; working through problems via, 172
 Louise, average ability, 171-72; ambivalence resulting from early shock, 206-43; characteristics, 206 ff., 212 ff., 229 ff.; contradictions in interviews with faculty, 207, 208; programs, 207, 209, 218, 223, 228, 231; abilities deployed on too many subjects, 207, 209, 210, 229; family and general background, 212, 237, 238; relationship with father, 212, 213, 230, 238, 241; campus friendships: social life, 213, 224; double attitude, 213, 214, 228, 239, 241; changed by traumatic shock, 215; relations to teachers and learning, 216; ambivalent attitude toward authority, 216, 234, 235, 241; conflicts, 216, 226, 234, 241, 243; reports on, 219, 220, 227; moral attitudes, 221, 226, 234, 235; interests, 221 ff.; character development, 239; test record, 242
 Lynd, Helen M., 121
 Madeleine, achievement versus development, 313-30; characteristics, 313, 315 ff., 326 ff.; limited ability, 313, 315; academic record, 314; general background: disruption in sense of security, 314, 316; anticipation in relation to life at college lay in social sphere, 315, 316; programs, 316, 319; homesickness, 317; difficulties of adjustment disappearing, 317 ff.; extravagant ambitions, 319, 320, 323, 328; record as a problem of guidance, 320; two types of needs, 321; pessimistic picture of educational possibilities, 322; advanced work, 322-29; emotional difficulties, 322-23, 326; repressions revealed, 324; what college had done for her, 324; record of conference in senior year, 325 ff.; engagement, 329; achievement, 329; test record, 330; a baffling student, 391
 Man, tendency to take opinion of, as final, 149, 151
 Mann, Thomas, 36, 44
 Marian, shy student, 302-12; family situation, 302, 306, 308, 309, 310; characteristics, 302 ff., 310; social life, 302, 304, 305; gain in confidence, 303, 304, 309; friendships, 304; attitudes, 304-6; dependence upon teachers' confidence in her, 305; interests, 306-11; programs, 306, 307; sources of shyness, 308; sense of inadequacy, 308; family ideal, 308, 309; should college encourage fourth year? 309; degree at Western college: married life: test record, 312
 Marriage-decision problems, 109
 Marriage unit, 40n
 Maslow Test, 138
 Masochistic type, 218
 Maturation, aspects of, 80; slow, 82
 Memory tests, rote, 120
 Menstruation, 112 ff.

- Mental growth, *see* Growth; Intellectual development
- Mental-hygiene approach to problems, 163
- Merrill-Palmer study of college women after graduation, 57, 138, 144
- Moreno, 31
- Mother, as authority, 153; identification with social-class values of, 153
- Motivation, interests and, 34-61; *see also* Interests
- Motor development in "drinking-in" and in active students, 159
- Munroe, Ruth L., 10, 111, 130, 131, 204
- Murray, H. A., 45
- Music, capacity to see analogies between painting and, 195
- Natural science, *see* Science
- Needs, as affecting interests, 34 f., 45-50; as determining areas of best development, 92
- Negroes, prejudice toward, 246; interest in, 284, 285, 295
- Nervousness damaging to chances of completing an A.B., 114
- Neuroticism, and menstrual difficulties, 112; damaging to chances of completing an A.B., 114
- Night matron, comments, 107
- Orientation, stages in growth and, 76-89; shock-reactions, 76-80; characteristic of child from early months, 159; assets and handicaps of, 160
- Overconscientiousness, 15, 26 ff.
- Overspecialization, explanations of, 54-5; regretted, 124, 129
- Parents, conflict about relations with, 30; parent-identifications, 83; effect of differences with on with, on works, 85; *see also* Family relationships; Father; Mother
- Passivity, 83, 146; a defense against anxiety, 84
- Patsy, need as a "scattered" student, 356; belated self-discovery, 356-67; background, 356; characteristics, 356, 358 ff., 363; social life, 356, 360; programs, 356, 358, 359, 362; slump in work, 357, 358, 360; upswing, 357, 360, 361; education nearly a failure, 360, 363, 365; reports on development, 363 ff.; no problems outside herself to account for failure to develop, 365, 366; how release was accomplished: test record, 366
- Perfectionism inhibits growth, 185
- Personality, contribution of general education to development of, 10; importance, 73; check-up of development, 100; those whose problems stem from their own characters, 128-57; problems within authority-dependence group, 145-56; mechanisms of general adaptation, 157; of each student has its own character, 157
- Personality patterns, 128-36; interest areas in relation to, 53-58; students who develop steadily, 128-30; students that teachers worry about, 130-36
- Physical difficulties, 105; *see also* Health
- Physical strain, 85
- Physiology, 40
- Plastic arts, therapeutic value of work in, 365
- Prejudice, 179, 192, 200
- Printed word, undiscriminating attribution of authority to, 150
- Priscilla, highest scholastic aptitude, 171; insight without persistent goals, 274-301; record summarized, 274; characteristics, 274, 276, 277 ff., 291 ff., 299, 300; report on four years' work, 274 ff.; interests, 274, 281, 284 f., 290, 295 ff.; programs, 275, 277, 289, 293; evaluation of educational experience, 276; aims, 278, 283, 293; family situation, 278 ff., 285, 286, 288, 294, 298; slump in work, 280; conferences on home problems with psychology teacher, 280 ff.; recommended to summer

- Priscilla (*Continued*)
 laboratory at Woods Hole, 283;
 cycles of energy and uneven spurts
 of work, 284, 288; experimental
 attitude, 284; interest in under-
 privileged minority groups, 284,
 285, 295; Rorschach tests inter-
 preted, 286, 291 ff.; need to ob-
 jectify problems, 287; social life:
 love affair, 288, 289, 291, 298,
 299; sudden turn toward a new
 life, 289; Junior College experi-
 ence, 299; test record, 301
- Problems, sources of, 12; role of, in
 learning, 104-16; social life dur-
 ing freshman year, 106-12; health,
 112-15; implications for guidance,
 115-16; students whose stem from
 own characters, 128-57; dealing
 with, 162-65; indirect and direct
 attacks, 163; working through via
 literature, 172; *see also* Family re-
 lationships
- Program, choice of, 122; illustration
 of what can be done when flexible
 planning permits, 356 ff.
- Psychiatrist, 31-32, 170
- Psychoanalytic approach to person-
 ality, 157
- Psychology courses, 40n
- Psychosomatic medicine, 157
- Rachel and Madeleine compared, 314
- Racial prejudice, 246
- Reading difficulties, 120
- Reality, response to world of author-
 ity and, 161-62
- Reason, effort to develop an inte-
 grated ability to, 164; *see also* In-
 tellect
- Rebellious attitude, *see* Hostility
- Receptive student, 158; has greater
 sensory than motor development,
 159
- Records, college, 84; use of, for case
 studies, 169, 392; *see also* Test
 records
- Relationships, difficulties in achiev-
 ing integrated, 163; *see also* Author-
 ity; Family relationships;
 Friendships; Social life
- Resistance, *see* Hostility
- Responses at different levels not nec-
 essarily consistent, 131
- Rigidity, 87, 130, 131, 143, 154, 321;
 rigid personality: Hortense, 174-
 205
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., and Eleanor
 Roosevelt, 36
- Rorschach Test, 15, 17, 119; Louise,
 215; Priscilla's interpreted, 286,
 291 ff.
- Rote memory tests, 120
- Sadism, 373
- Sarah Lawrence College, students
 more self-confident than general
 run of college girls, 138; above av-
 erage intellectually and socially,
 141; records, 169; integration of
 arts with academic work: need to
 integrate outside experience as part
 of course, 390
- Scattered students, 105, 123-24, 130,
 131; Louise, 217, 221, 229; Patsy,
 356-67; Anne, 367-79; challeng-
 ing and difficult to educate, 378
- Scatter rooted in anxiety, 27
- School, influence of secondary edu-
 cation, 77, 80
- Science, interest in, 38 ff.; students
 poorly equipped to handle mate-
 rials, 56; neglect of science widens
 gap between men and women, 57;
 few girls gravitate toward, 123
- Security, need for, 144
- Self-confidence, superiority of Sarah
 Lawrence girls in, 138
- Self-distrust, 220, 239; *see also* In-
 feriority feelings of
- Sex conflict, 30
- Sexual maturation, 80, 113
- Shock, ambivalence resulting from,
 206 ff.; traumatic, 215; cause of
 unsatisfied attitude of dependence:
 need to move away from, 217
- Shock-reactions as part of first phase
 of orientation, 76-80
- "Show-off" behavior, 187, 227, 230
- Shyness, study of, 15; those who find
 contacts with new people difficult
 apt to dislike field work, 121; in
 conference and class, 137 ff.; in

- relation to objective world, 138;
Marian, 302-12; *see also* Insecurity
- Sibling tensions, 212, 339-55
- Snobbishness, 188, 200
- Social change, individual education and, 3-9
- Social life, freshman year, 106-12;
week-end leaves, 106 ff. *passim*;
significance of life inside and outside college, to individual, 107;
campus adjustment, 109; sources of strain on campus, 110
- Social problems, lack of interest in, 123
- Social science, students' interest in, 38 ff.; use of, to attain perspective and ability to view problems objectively, 105; importance of, 122; resistance to courses, 123
- Social strain, 105
- Spasmodic workers, 130 ff. *passim*
- Specialization, 124-26; excessive, 124, 129
- Spontaneity, need for more, 31
- Stolz, H. R., 81
- Strain, *see* Tensions
- Strong Vocational Interest ratings: Hortense, 205; Louise, 211, 242; Priscilla, 301; Anne, 379
- Student Work Committee, 32-33, 84, 91, 181, 182; duties, 169, 170
- Study of Adolescents, 139
- Subject matter, influence of social changes upon, 3 ff.
- Success without growth, 313-55; Madeleine, 313-30; Julia, 330-38; Judith, 338-55
- Superficiality, 133 ff., 143, 217
- Superiority, urge to demonstrate, 180, 188
- Talent, development of, a natural focus for interest, 35
- Teachability, 237
- Teachers, task to learn how students can achieve freedom and decisiveness, 12; personal relationship with students, 23; value lies in subject matter and ways of working, 53; different assumptions of students and, re processes and meanings of learning, 69-73; teacher-student rapport contributes to learning, 73-74; freshman comments on, 73; conception of integrated learning, 90; kind of help given, 96; percentage of freshman class that fits into expectation, 128-30; students they worry about, 130-36; identification with, 146; relationship with, 150, 153; observations re experimental disciplines, 157; use of records for case studies, 169; raw material of reports, 170; *see also* Guidance
- Teaching, as guidance, 29-31; therapeutic value, 29; attitudes toward being taught and, 69-73; things that lie back of satisfactions and dissatisfactions, 73
- Technical problems, increasing interest in, 57
- Tensions, 113, 206; *see also* Family relationships; Sibling tensions
- Test records, *see* Allport-Vernon Values Study; American Council of Education Test Scores; Bernreuter Personality Inventory ratings; Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Women
- Therapy, all good teaching therapeutic, 29, 31; uses of the curriculum as: Patsy and Anne, 356-79; dramatic art as psychological, 387
- Thought and thinking, resistance to new ideas, 147; independent, 152; relating oneself to world of activity and thought, 158-60; ways of, 164; unity of feeling and thought, 164; a correction to deterministic, 380-93; *see also* Intellect
- Tiebout, H. M., 10
- Traumatic shock, 215, 217
- Unhappy students, length of stay in college, 108
- Unity of feeling and thought, 164
- Vagueness, 120
- Values, broadening and reshaping of attitudes and, 76
- Verbosity, tendency toward, 281, 282
- Virginia, a correction to deterministic thinking, 380-93; background:

Virginia (*Continued*)

family relationships, 380, 383 ff. *passim*; programs, 380, 386; characteristics: personality, 380, 382 ff.; ill health: spiritual conflict, 380 ff. *passim*; one of few students who is a pure pleasure, 381, 389 f.; don's report, 382; sophomore melancholia, 382, 383; social life, 383; desire for economic independence, 383, 386, 392; résumé of first year, 384 ff.; has every warrant to be maladjusted, and is not, 385; moments of wanting to leave college, 385, 388; year in business school: return to college, 386; report of second year, 387; used program as springboard to other educational projects, 388; personality structure developed by home and family stress, 388 ff.; catching up the threads: psychological issues, 389; work done beyond academic limits accounts in part for her success, 390; comments after five years out

of college: insecurity with other girls, 392; test record, 393

War, effect upon family and heterosexual adjustments, 115

Week-end leaves, 106 ff. *passim*

"Whole student" not easy to see, 170

Women, college: Merrill-Palmer study of, after graduation, 57, 138, 144

Work, difficulties with specific types, 117-27; writing and reading, 117-21; field work and laboratory observation, 121-23; scatter and specialization, 123-26; implications for guidance, 126-27; fear a factor in disorganized habits, 143; methods, 162, 164; worrying attitudes toward, 163; students who have worked a year or so between high school and college get more out of course, 390

Writing, difficulties in, 117-21

Zachry, Caroline, 20, 139